THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E 965
T582 47,391

VOLUME THE TWENTY-SIXTH.

October 1914–September 1915.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

Printed by

MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON	SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER	JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK	CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXVI.

AUTHORS.

Ven. Principal WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A.— PAGE
A Study in the Synoptic Problem . 264

Rev. JAMES BAIKIE—
The Excavations at Babylon . . 270
Pre-Hellenic Civilization . . . 514

Rev. JOHN A. BAIN, M.A.—
Psalm 145 94

Rev. J. AGAR BEET, D.D.—
Another Solution of Revelation 20–22 . 217
The Study of Theology . . . 510

Rev. R. B. BOSWELL, M.A.—
Destroying and Rebuilding the Temple 140

Professor ERNESTO BUONAIUTI—
St. Paul's Imprisonment at Rome and the Text of the Acts . . . 520

Rev. CHARLES CALLOW, M.A.—
'House' 378

Rev. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.—
Salt 139

Professor S. J. CASE, Ph.D.—
John Mark 372

Rev. R. H. CHARLES, D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A.—
A Solution of the Chief Difficulties in Revelation 20–22 . . . 54, 119

Rev. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, M.A.—
Acts 27^{17} 377

Professor H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A.—
Corrigenda and Addenda in the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon 376

Rev. W. ARTHUR CORNABY—
Chinese Sidelights upon Scripture Passages 18, 60, 369

Rev. W. CRUICKSHANK, B.D.—
Aramaic Incantation Texts . . . 522

Professor SAMUEL DAICHES, Ph.D.—
Deuteronomy 33^{2} 178
Amos 3^{3-8} 237
Amos 6^{2} 562
Amos 6^{5} 521

Rev. JAMES DONALD, D.D.— PAGE
Corrigenda and Addenda to the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon 477

Rev. D. H. EDWARDS, M.A.—
The Elberfeld Horses 284

Rev. W. D. GARDINER, B.D.—
The Denial of St. Peter . . . 424

Rev. W. R. W. GARDNER, M.A.—
Genesis 14^{14} 523

Principal A. E. GARVIE, D.D.—
In Praise of Faith . . 199, 278, 328
The Pioneer of Faith and of Salvation 502, 546

Chief Rabbi M. GASTER, Ph.D.—
The Lord of Hosts 457

Mrs. MARGARET D. GIBSON, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.—
Arabic Christian Literature . 31, 63, 230
Revelation 16^{16} 376

Professor G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A., D.Litt., D.D.—
'Breach for Breach' and 'The Breach of his People' 347

Professor J. A. F. GREGG, D.D.—
The Use of the Old Testament . . 359

Professor L. W. GRENSTED—
The Use of Enoch in St. Luke 16^{19-31} . 333

EDWARD GRUBB, M.A.—
The Anointing of Jesus . . . 461

J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.—
An Unnoticed Aramaism in St. Mark . 248

Rev. E. W. HIRST, M.A., B.Sc.—
The Implications of the Golden Rule . 555

Rev. JAMES H. HODSON, B.D.—
A Study in Christian Experience . . 398

Professor S. H. HOOKE, B.D.—
Gog and Magog 317

Principal J. IVERACH, M.A., D.D.—
The Idealist Reaction against Science . 363
Know Thyself 418

Rev. J. COURTENAY JAMES, M.A., B.D.—
Boanerges 45
Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ 428

PAGE

Rev. J. G. James, M.A., D.Litt.—
The Theology of Paul and the Teaching of Jesus Christ 7

Eleanor Anglin Johnson—
The Unrealized Christianity of Shelley . 488

Rev. G. Herbert King, M.A.—
'House' 378

Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E.—
Illustrations of Spiritual Truths from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' . . 40

Professor Dr. Ludwig Koehler—
Boanerges 236

Stephen H. Langdon, Ph.D.—
The Semitic *iau* 474

Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.—
'House' 238

Rev. John R. Legge, M.A.—
The Place of Prayer in the Christian Life. 87

Rev. A. H. Lemon, B.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 274

Herbert Loewe, M.A.—
Genesis 41^{40} 332
Numbers 22^{6} 378

Rev. J. Strahan McKee, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque 405

Rev. Alexander R. Mackenzie, M.A.—
'Likeness' 524

Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D.—
The Name of Jesus 151

Professor Robert Mackintosh, M.A., D.D.—
The Beatitudes 415

Rev. P. J. Maclagan, D.Phil.—
Amos 9^{13} 237

Rev. A. D. Martin—
The Book of Job 75
Sabbatismos 563

Basil Mathews, M.A.—
Where did Paul speak at Athens? . 281

Rev. James Matthew, B.D.—
Reminiscence of Rabbi Duncan . . 334

Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque . . . 366, 403

Rev. Edward Metcalfe—
Thoughts on Prayer 565

Alphonse Mingana, Ph.D.—
Lewisian and Curetonian Versions of the Gospels . . . 47, 93, 235
Judges 15^{8} 332
The Remaining Syriac Versions of the Gospels 379

Professor James Moffatt, D.D., D.Litt.— PAGE
Jesus upon 'Stumbling-blocks' . . . 407

Professor James Hope Moulton, D.Lit., D.D., D.C.L.—
Ἀγάπη 139
Σκάνδαλον 331
'Inspired' Supplication (James 5^{16}) . 381

Rev. Cavendish Moxon, M.A.—
Jesus' Teaching and Modern Thought . 537

Rev. A. D. Mozley, M.A.—
John 1^{29} 46
John 11^{45} 91

Rev. T. Nicklin, M.A.—
'Stumbling-block' 479

Rev. W. D. Niven, M.A.—
Luke 12^{4} 44

Rev. H. Northcote, M.A.—
A Solution of the Chief Difficulties in Revelation 20–22 426

William Olney—
Conflict in Prayer 424

Rev. Robert Oswald, B.D.—
The Task of To-day 471

Rev. E. Over, M.A.—
James 5^{16} 476

Professor W. P. Paterson, D.D.—
A Sage among the Prophets . . 105

Rev. W. J. Pearce, M.A.—
Love and the Best Love 477

Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D.—
Fresh Light on the Book of Daniel . 297
The Niffer Story of the Creation and the Flood 490

Rev. John Pinkerton, B.D.—
National Hate 299

Rev. A. Plummer, D.D.—
'Danaïds and Dirces' in the Epistle of Clement 560

Rev. Augustus Poynder, M.A.—
'Mine Hour is not yet Come' (John 2^{4}) 478

Rev. W. J. Price, M.A.—
'Art thou Weary, art thou Languid?' . 179

Rev. Frederick J. Rae, M.A.—
The Heart of Jesus: A Communion Meditation 250

Sir William M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D.—
The Old Testament in the Roman Phrygia 168

Rev. J. A. Robertson, M.A.—
The Tragic Schism: Can it be Healed? 343
The Tragic Schism: Has it been Healed? 441

Professor A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt.— PAGE
Recent Biblical and Oriental Archæology 25, 89, 128
The Archæology of the Book of Genesis 421, 558

Rev. Herbert S. Seekings—
Virginibus Puerisque 209

Professor J. A. Selbie, D.D.—
The New Edition of Davidson's Hebrew Grammar 211

Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A.—
The War in its Relation to the Kingdom of God 180
Conflict in Prayer 314

Rev. C. Ryder Smith, M.A.—
The Eagle and her Young 237

Rev. R. Somervell, M.A.—
Is not Fighting incompatible with the Teaching of Jesus Christ? . . 234
Devendranath Tagore 283

Rev. A. F. Taylor, M.A.—
Cura Curarum 59
An Induction Sermon 494

Rev. P. Thomson, D.D.— PAGE
James 5^{16} 476

Rev. William Upright—
Virginibus Puerisque 57

Rev. W. Edgar Wallis—
Virginibus Puerisque 186

Professor A. C. Welch, D.D., D.Th.—
A Problem in Jeremiah 429

Rev. G. H. Whitaker, M.A.—
Light on ἐνεργεῖν from War and Music 474

Rev. Walter G. White—
St. John 4^{27}. 180

Rev. W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D.—
Fulfilment of the Law 20

Alban G. Widgery, M.A.—
The Study of Theology 392

Rev. J. Willcock, D.D.—
Prophetic Trances 92

Rev. W. Gray Williams, M.A.—
The Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke $15^{11\text{-}32}$) 141

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Adonai 459
Arabic Christian Literature 31, 63, 230
Aramaism, Unnoticed in St. Mark 248
Archæology, Biblical and Oriental, 25 89, 128
,, Genesis . . 421, 558
Areopagus 282
Babel, Tower 272
Babylon, Excavations . . 270
Beatitudes 415
Belief 388
Belshazzar 271, 297
Boanerges 45, 236
Breach for Breach . . . 347
Chinese Sidelights upon Scripture Passages . . 18, 60, 369
Christ, Crucifixion . . . 442
,, Deity 1
,, Eschatology . . . 340
,, Infallible . . . 339
,, Ministry 11
,, Personal Experience 502, 546
,, Teaching . . 7, 234
Christian, What is? . . . 534
Christianity 11
,, Failure . . . 534
Clement, Epistle . . . 560
Commentary, Great Text, 26, 82, 124, 174, 213, 266
Creation 19
,, Niffer Story . . . 490
Crucifixion 442
Cura Curarum 59

PAGE
'Danaïds and Dirces' . . 560
Daniel, Fresh Light on . . 297
Darius the Mede . . . 298
Deuteronomy 170
Doubt 531
Duncan, Rabbi 334
East and West 3
Ecclesiastes 106
Elberfeld Horses . . 150, 284
Elohim 460
Eschatology, Gospel . . 340
Experience, Christian . . 398
Exposition, Notes of Recent 1, 49, 97, 145, 193, 241, 289, 337, 385, 433, 481, 529
Faith, In Praise of . 199, 278, 328
Fall 60
Fellowship 527
Fighting 234
Flood, Niffer Story . . . 490
Fog 544
Forgiveness 441
Genesis, Archæology . . 421
German Spiritual Music . . 566
Glory 241
God, Fatherhood . . . 338
,, Forgiveness . . 441
,, Names 457
,, Reconciliation . . 443
,, Sovereignty . . . 53
,, Suffering . . . 50
Gog and Magog 317
Golden Rule 530
Gospels, Arrangement . . 49
Hammurabi, Code . . . 289

PAGE
Hate, National 299
Hebrews, Jesus in . . 502, 546
Herd Instinct 484
Hip and Thigh 195
Hittites 25, 89
'House' 238, 378
Illustrations from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' . . . 40
Imaginations 246
Infinite 4
Intercession . . . 293, 316
Jesus, Anointing . . . 461
,, Heart 250
,, Name 151
,, Personal Experience 502, 546
,, Teaching and Modern Thought . . . 537
Job, Book 75
John Mark 372
Judas Iscariot . . . 433, 463
Law, Fulfilment . . 11, 20
Lewisian and Curetonian Versions of the Gospels . 47, 93, 235
Life, Future 193
'Likeness' 524
Lord of Hosts 457
Love 6, 477
Mark, John 372
Mary Magdalene . . . 485
Metaphor 19
Miracle 244
Mithras 196
Mysticism 146
Nabopolassar 272
Nietzsche 196

	PAGE
Niffer Story of Creation and the Flood	490
Non-resistance	337
Old Testament in Roman Phrygia	168
,, Use of	359
Oxford Heb. Lexicon, Corrigenda and Addenda	376, 477
Parallelism	19
Paul at Athens	281
,, Imprisonment	520
,, Theology	7
Peregrini	520
Peter, Denial	424
Phrygia, Jews in	168
Prayer	292, 382, 385, 483
,, As Pulpit Theme	525
,, Conflict in	314, 424
,, for Rain	529
,, in Christian Life	87
,, Thoughts on	565
Reconciliation	443
Religion	5
,, and Science	51
,, Origin	61
Repentance	444
Reserve, Religious	386
Revelation xx.–xxii., Another Solution	217
Revelation xx.–xxii., Difficulties in	54, 119
Sabaoth	457
Sage among the Prophets	105
Salt	50, 139
Salvation	103
Schism, Tragic	343, 441
Science, Idealist Reaction against	363
Sergius Paulus	388
Seven	19
Shelley, Unrealized Christianity	488
Sinner	486
'Stumbling-block'	331, 479
,, Jesus upon	407
Suffering	81
,, of God	50
,, Vicarious	148
Synoptic Problem	264
Syriac Versions of the Gospels	379
Task of To-day	471
Theology, Foreign	418, 514
,, of Paul	7
,, Study of	392, 510
Thomas	531
Trance, Prophetic	92
Virginibus Puerisque,	15, 57, 133, 185, 204, 274, 323, 366, 402, 467, 496, 541
Wisdom	107
Worship	371

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Abbott, New Kingdom	447
Aikenhead, Letters	36
Aitken, Christ of the Men of Art	351
Alexander, Glory in the Grey	129
Aliotta, Idealist Reaction against Science	363
Anderson, Man of Nazareth	161
Angus, Environment of Early Christianity	256
Baikie, Lands and Peoples of the Bible	68
Baldwin, Genetic Theory of Reality	449
Ball, Correspondence of Swift, v., vi.	304
Barber, Morning of Life	133
Barton, Bernadotte	158
Beecher, Pulpit Themes	525
Beet, Medieval Papacy	71
,, Theologian's Workshop	203
Bergson, Dreams	313
,, Philosophy of Change	450
Bond, Dedications and Patron Saints of English Churches	310
Boreham, Golden Milestone	320
Branford, Interpretations and Forecasts	35
Brisco, Economics of Efficiency	258
Buchanan, Four Gospels from the Latin Text of Harl. 1023	355
Budge, Egyptian People	165
,, Literature of Ancient Egyptians	165
Bull, Sacramental Principle	413
Bullen, Reminiscences	450
Carchemish	26
Carnegie, Democracy	162
Carré, Paul's Doctrine of Redemption	259
Cheyne, Reconciliation of Races and Religions	226
Christensen, Crowd Morality	551
Clough, Social Christianity in the Orient	167
Cobb, Spiritual Healing	165
Conn, Social Heredity	114
Connell, Endless Quest	246
Cook, Study of Religions	227
,, Zeus	302
Costain, Men in the Making	369
Cox, In Life's Golden Time	206
Croce, Philosophy of Hegel	448
Davids, Buddhist Psychology	308
Davidson, Hebrew Grammar	211
Davis, Asiatic Dionysos	224
DeForest, Evolution of a Missionary	112
Drawbridge, Objections to Christianity	118
Driver, Ideals of the Prophets	310
Dussaud, Civilisations Préhelléniques	514
Ellis, Man and Woman	455
,, Affirmations	506
Farquhar, Modern Religious Movements in India	351
Figgis, Fellowship of the Mystery	162
Fitzgerald, The Pilgrim Road	526
,, Sévigné Dictionary	187
Flew, Saints of Yesterday	452
Fraser, Winning a Primitive People	167
Frazer, Golden Bough, xii.	410
,, Essays of Joseph Addison	311
Freston, The Quest of Beauty	568
Funk, Church History	222
Gardner, Ephesian Gospel	481
Germany in the 19th Century	312
Giles, Confucianism	510
Gilliat-Smith, St. Claire of Assisi	254
Goddard, Feeble-mindedness	357
Godley, Great Condé	446
Green, Australian Sermons	130
Grisar, Luther, iv.	411
Groton, Eucharist and Pagan Cults	116
Hall, Ægean Archæology	514
Halliday, Facts and Values	314
Harper, Stead: The Man	261
Harrison, Religion and Art	110
Hausrath, Treitschke	226
Headlam, Miracles of the N.T.	244
Hepher, Fellowship of Silence	413
Hill, The Sword of the Lord	210
Hogg, Christianity and Force	337
Hogg and Vine, Thessalonians	260
Holdsworth, Life Indeed	131
Holland, So as by Fire	566
Holmes, Is Death the End?	455
Holt, Beacon for the Blind	504
Horne, Romance of Preaching	111
Hoyt, Elements of Preaching	182
Hughes, Citizens to Be	552
Hutchinson, Sir John Lubbock	221
Huxley Memorial Lectures	310
Illingworth, Gospel Miracles	385
International Crisis	484
Jerdan, Seed-Corn and Bread	204
Johns, Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples	289
Jones, Gospel of Sovereignty	53
Keller, Societal Evolution	453
Kerin, Living Touch	114
Koldewey, Excavations at Babylon	270
Laguna, Ethics	454
Lake, Stewardship of Faith	339
Langdon, Texts from Nippur	128
Lees, Divine Master in Home Life	455
Leith, Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland	453
Lejeune, Mystical Life	230
Lewis, Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns	69
Lidgett, God in Christ Jesus	554
Lithgow, The Parabolic Gospel	69
Lorimer, Early Days of St. Cuthbert's	412
Lukach, City of Dancing Dervishes	258
Lund, Sower went Forth	132
Macaulay, Hist. of England	67, 228, 449
MacCaffrey, Catholic Church from the Renaissance to the French Revolution	354
McConnell, White Wings	544

	PAGE
McDowall, Evolution and Spiritual Life	529
Macfarlane, Donald John Martin	155
McGiffert, Modern Religious Ideas	453
Macgregor, Christian Freedom	146
Mackinlay, Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland	306
Mackintosh, Albrecht Ritschl	309
Macmillan, Robert Flint	223
M'Neile, St. Matthew's Gospel	505
Macnicol, Indian Theism	506
Maeterlinck, Unknown Guest	150
Mangold, Child Welfare	72
Mark, Factors in Conduct	414
Mason, Church of England and Episcopacy	99
Meyer, Reich u. Kultur der Chetiter	25
Minto, Memorials	182
Money, Future of Work	75
Montgomery, St. Augustine	164
,, Aramaic Incantation Texts	522
Moore, Economic Cycles	312
Morgan, Port Royal	257
Morton, Galloway and the Covenanters	310
Mott, Mental Development	73
Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the N.T.	155
Mursell, Byways in Bookland	115
Nivedità, Footfalls of Indian History	356
Noguchi, Spirit of Japanese Art	414
Oesterley, Apocrypha	156
Orr, Dante and the Early Astronomers	68
Ottley, Work and Worship	313
Parker, Winning the Children	470
Paton, John Brown Paton	253
Peabody, Christian Life in the Modern World	436
Plummer, St. Mark	160, 452
,, 2 Corinthians	353
Pratt, Wingless Angel	135
Preston, Lord Strathcona	158
Rainy, Adam Rolland Rainy	305
Ramsay, Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament	388
Rashdall, Is Conscience an Emotion?	166
Reason, Knight and the Dragon	277
Reed, Hinduism in Europe and America	358
Roberts, Christ and Ourselves	540
Robinson, Christian Missions	550
Robson, 2 Peter	412
Rutherford, Seer's House	97
Science and Religion	245
Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement	39
Scott-Moncrieff, Consciousness of the Spiritual	257
Seippel, Living Witness	147
Selbie, Andrew Martin Fairbairn	224
Selwyn, Teaching of Christ	338
Shankar, Buddha and his Sayings	70
Sharp, Epictetus and the N.T.	71
Shepheard-Walwyn, Look Straight Ahead	501
Smith, Epistle of St. James	203
,, Religion of Israel	66
Stalker, Christian Psychology	202
Stevenson, Heart of Jainism	506
Stone, Flowers of Gold	324
Stopes, Shakespeare's Environment	157
Sturt, Understanding	309
Sutherland, Bonds of Society	35
Sweet, Study of the English Bible	37
Tagore, Maharshi Devendranath Tagore	145, 283
Taussig, Economics	448
Taylor, Deliverance	414
Terry, Constructive Theology	166
Thilly, Hist. of Philosophy	111
Thureau-Dangin, English Catholic Revival	353
Tollington, Clement of Alexandria	36
Toynbee, Nationality and the War	389
Tunnicliff, King's Scout	406
Türck, Man of Genius	34
Tynan, Flower of Youth	568
Underhill, Ruysbroeck	354
Valentine, Experimental Psychology	69
Varisco, Know Thyself	418
Vedder, Gospel of Jesus	161
Venosta, Memoirs of Youth	66
Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam	412
Walpole, Gospel of Hope	203
Wardrop, Visramiani	74
Warfield, Saviour of the World	51
Webb, Natural Theology	551
Wesley, Journal, vi.	410
Wickham, Words of Light and Life	255
Wicks, Doctrine of God in Jewish Literature	157
Widdicombe, Memories and Musings	307

HEBREW AND ARAMAIC WORDS.

	PAGE
אבי, אבא	429
בֶּרֶק	347
בְּנֵיבְרַק	45
דָּן	523
מוֹקֵשׁ	331, 479
מְכֻשׁוֹל	331
פֶּרֶץ	347
רבוני, רבי	429
רֹגֶז	45
רָנַשׁ	45
רֶשֶׁף	45
שֶׁבֶר	347

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ	428
ἀγαπάω	478
ἀγάπη	139
ἄδης	333
ἁμαρτωλός	486
ἀπαντήν	139
Βοανηργές	45, 236
ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι	248
ἐνεργεῖν	292, 382, 474
ἐνσκολιευόμενος	479
κόλασις	139
κολοβοδάκτυλος	375
μακάριος	172
παγίς	479
παρεισέρχομαι	334
σαββατισμός	563
σκάνδαλον	331, 407, 479
στρατοπεδάρχης	521
συναντήν	139
φιλέω	478

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gn i. 2	19, 103
i. 2–31	18
ii. 1–3	18
ii. 4–iii. 24	62
iii. 8	402
viii. 1	275
viii. 18–22	421
ix. 1, 3, 4	422
ix. 5	15
ix. 5–6	422
ix. 8–17	422
ix. 18	558
ix. 20, 21, 24, 25–27	559
ix. 28	560
x. 2	318
xiv. 14	523
xviii.–xix. 15	371
xxxvii. 3	370
xli. 40	332
xlvii. 8	185
xlvii. 9	371
Ex xii. 2	367
xvii. 15	137
xx. 2	460
xxii. 10, 14	349
Lv xx. 14	291
xxi. 9	291
xxi. 19	348
xxii. 22	349
xxiv. 20	347
xxvi. 5	237
Nu xiii. 33	325
xiv. 9	325
xxii. 6	378
xxiv. 7	318
Dt iv. 6	468
vi. 4	460
xii. 9–12	564
xxvii.–xxix.	171
xxxii. 11	101, 237
xxxii. 35	41
xxxiii. 2	178
Jg xv. 8	195, 332
Ruth ii. 7	541
1 S xix. 20–24	92
1 K xviii. 21, 37, 39	460
xx. 11	42
1 Ch xxviii. 4	366
Job i. 5	370
ii. 5	77
ix. 32–35	78
x. 10–16	78
xvii. 3	79
xix. 26, 27	78
xxiii. 10	79
xxvii. 2–6	79
xl. 19	479
Ps i. 2	335

	PAGE
Ps vii. 16	41, 43
li. 4	124
lxviii. 23	479
cxlv.	94
Pr i. 32	42
x. 23	42
xi. 4	42
xii. 10	41
xiii. 21	42
xiv. 11	42
xv. 27	42
xx. 27	57
xxviii. 15	41
Ec iii. 11	467
vii. 25	105
Is i. 13–17	44
viii. 14, 15	479
xxviii. 16	479
xxx. 20, 21	494
Jer vi. 14	350
vii. 9–11	44
viii. 11	350
viii. 21	350
x. 19	350
xiv. 17	350
xvi. 20, 21	460
xxi. 11–xxii. 30	429
xliv. 18	371
La ii. 13	349
Ezk i. 4	543
xxx. 21	349
xxxiv. 4	349
xxxviii.–xxxix.	318
Dn ii. 46	372
viii. 1	297
x. 1	298
xi. 38	42
Hos ix. 8	479
Am iii. 3–8	237
vi. 2	562
vi. 5	521
vi. 6	350
viii. 1	496
ix. 13	237
Ob 15, 21	299
Mic vi. 6, 7	371
vii. 4	324
vii. 18	44
Hab iii. 19	459
Mal iii. 14	371
Mt i. 21	151
iv. 9, 10	372
v. 3–11	415
v. 17	20
v. 39–41	337
v. 44	299
vii. 12	530
ix. 5	2

	PAGE
Mt x. 36	58
xi. 2–19	264
xi. 27	3
xii. 41	2
xiii. 2	249
xiii. 41	407
xiii. 55, 56	16
xvi. 23	409
xviii. 6, 7	407
xxvi. 6–13	461
xxvi. 69–75	424
Mk iii. 17	45, 236
iv. 1	248
ix. 42–48	408
ix. 49	50, 139
xi. 26	50
xiii. 31	204
xiv. 3–9	461
xiv. 66–72	424
Lk v. 3	249
vi. 20–22	415
vi. 31	530
vi. 35	133
vii. 18–35	264
vii. 36–50	461
vii. 37–39	486
vii. 40	97
xi. 21	2
xii. 4	44
xv. 11–32	141
xvi. 19–31	333
xvii. 1, 2	407
xvii. 32	26
xx. 18	331
xxi. 9–11	42
xxii. 55–60	424
xxiv. 6	323
Jn i. 29	46
ii. 4	478
ii. 19	140
iv. 27	180
v. 23	43
v. 40	499
viii. 42	339
x. 9	540
xi. 45	91
xii. 1–8	461
xiii. 35	41
xviii. 16–27	424
xxi. 15–17	478
xxi. 17	7
Ac iv. 13	274
iv. 23	498
v. 29	521
v. 39	521
xiii. 12	388
xvi. 2, 3	169
xvii. 19, 22	282

	PAGE
Ac xvii. 28	10
xxvii. 17	377
xxviii. 16	520
Ro v. 20	82, 334
vii. 24, 25	266
viii. 28	213
ix. 29	457
ix. 33	331
1 Co i. 23	332
vii. 19	534
x. 21	40
xiii.	10, 13
xv. 33	10
xvi. 13	44
2 Co v. 4	10
x. 5	246
Gal v. 6	534
v. 11	332
v. 16–25	398
vi. 15	534
Eph v. 16	471
v. 19	209
vi. 11–18	44
Phil ii. 3	41
iii. 13	403
iv. 19	174
Col i. 24	149
i. 27	241
1 Ti iv. 3	43
vi. 12	135
2 Ti iii. 15	359
Tit i. 12	10
ii. 12	436
He ii. 11	503, 504
ii. 12, 13	503
ii. 16	503
iii. 7	563
iv. 13	563
iv. 15, 16	250
xi. 1, 6	199, 278, 328
xii. 1, 2	199, 278, 328
Ja v. 4	457
v. 16	292, 381, 476
v. 17, 18	382
1 P ii. 8	331
Rev ii. 7	60
xiv. 3	438
xvi. 16	376
xx. 7–10	54, 318
xx. 11–15	54
xx.–xxii.	54, 119, 217, 426
xxi. 1–4	54
xxi. 6	60
xxi. 24–27	55
xxii. 2	55
xxii. 2, 19	60
xxii. 15	55
xxii. 17	60

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In the letter which Professor Sanday addressed to the Bishop of Oxford, a letter which went such a long way towards meeting the difficulties of present-day thought on miracle, there was one sentence that must have been peculiarly disappointing to the unbeliever in miracle. It was the sentence in which he expressed his heartfelt belief in the deity of our Lord.

How is it that Dr. Sanday retains that belief, and retains it so assuredly? It is not with him a matter of custom or environment; it is not due to sentiment. No scholar of our day takes himself to task more sternly to see that his faith has reality to rest upon. As with all his beliefs, this also is due to his appreciation of the evidence. There is in the New Testament so much in favour of the deity of Christ, and that much is so powerfully strengthened by the record of Christian experience, that, when many things which once he believed have gone, this thing, the greatest of all, has remained to him and is more surely believed now than ever.

In a sermon preached in the Temple Church and reported in the new volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.) Dr. Sanday lifts a corner of the evidence which is offered by the New Testament. It is the evidence contained in the Synoptic Gospels. He chooses the Synoptic Gospels because just on this very subject there is a difference between them and the Fourth Gospel. The Fourth Gospel has much to say about the deity of Christ, and says it directly. In the Synoptic Gospels the evidence is indirect, and, with one exception, it is found in small sayings or incidental allusions. For the Fourth Gospel was written with the express purpose of bringing out the deity of our Lord. The evangelist himself says so. He says, 'These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.' The Synoptic Gospels are not entirely without this motive. But it is not prominent in them. It does not take the first place. It does not influence to the same degree the composition and form of their narratives. There is 'a great naturalness and simplicity' about them. And it is just this naturalness and simplicity that give value to the picture they present of the person of our Lord. It makes the light that they throw on His person more penetrating than that of the Fourth Gospel. It reveals Him more completely and more convincingly.

We are so familiar with the Christ of the Gospels that we do not see how unexpectedly natural He is. If *we* had written a Gospel we should have emphasized the things that appealed most powerfully to our minds. If we had tried to describe a Divine life upon earth we should have

taken good care that it should be seen at once to be Divine. We should have singled out the strongest expressions and put them in the strongest relief. The beauty of the Gospels is that they reflect the light as it really was; they do not force their own interests upon it. They leave it to tell its own tale.

The first example that Professor SANDAY takes is from the Gospel according to St. Mark. It is the familiar story of the healing of the palsied man who was let down through the roof of the crowded chamber by four of his friends. The Lord observed their faith, and gave the sick man the benefit of it. He said to him: 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.' But then He noticed that there were certain scribes sitting by, and that they were complaining, in an undertone, to each other: 'Why doth this man thus speak? he blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but one, even God?' The narrative goes on to tell how Jesus, perceiving in His spirit that they so reasoned within themselves said unto them: 'Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house. And immediately he arose, took up the bed and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.'

Now this story makes one of the highest claims that ever were made by Jesus or for Him. It claims that He has power to forgive sins. But how is the claim made? It is made in a parenthesis. That which is the centre of the narrative, that which lifts Jesus high above all that is human, arises out of the story as a subordinate detail; a parenthesis is enough for it.

Quite as parenthetic, yet quite as amazing, is the claim that is made when the Pharisees accuse Him of casting out demons through Beelzebub, the prince of the demons. He refutes that idea. And then He draws a lesson from the discussion. 'When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils.' The strong man armed is Satan, but our Lord leaves His audience to guess who is the stronger than he. And He says: 'If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you.' But He does not stay to press home the application to His own person; He contents Himself with saying that the victory over Satan is proof that the Kingdom is coming. He does not even point the obvious moral that He is the Prince and Ruler of that Kingdom. He leaves His hearers to draw the inference, but He does not draw it for them.

There is a still finer example in the immediate context. 'The men of Nineveh,' says Jesus, 'shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgement with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here.' Notice the indirect way in which Christ speaks of Himself. He does not use the first person, but the third. He does not say, 'I do this or that'; He says, 'The Son of Man does this or that.' The very title He uses seems to lay more emphasis upon His humanity than upon His divinity. And yet He had no doubt whatever in His own mind, and He does not leave His hearers in any doubt, as to the extent of His own implied claim of authority. He is well aware that His own coming marks an epoch in the history of the world such as had never been before: 'Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater

than John the Baptist, yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven (in that new order of things which He came to found) is greater than he.'

Dr. SANDAY said that to the reticence and reserve of the Synoptic Gospels on the Divinity there is one exception. It is the single verse: 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' The verse is introduced most abruptly. We should expect so direct and lofty an announcement to be introduced by some preface, setting forth the uniqueness of this relation at some length, but there is none. It is possible, Dr. SANDAY thinks, and even probable, that the original saying was longer and fuller than we have it now. But the very abruptness of it is characteristic. It is a sentence full of a high theology, yet the Synoptists offer it just as they find it. The less suspicion attaches to it that it is unique. Its uniqueness is in keeping with the unstudied simplicity of these Gospels throughout.

But the uniqueness of this saying throws into contrast the general reserve of the first three Gospels. Professor SANDAY believes that we do not appreciate the delicacy of that reserve. It is a true reflexion of the reserve of Christ Himself. 'He came to manifest His glory, but it was a glory veiled, and not revealed, at least not revealed in the full blaze of His day. His sojourn upon earth was but the prelude to a great outpouring of the Spirit which has continued all down the ages, and is in full force even now.'

Of the things that are likely to emerge from the present upheaval one great thing is as likely as any other. It is that the East and the West will be drawn closer together. It is not merely that India and Great Britain will be drawn closer, or Great Britain and Japan. It is that all over the East and all over the West there is likely to be a new and serious looking into those things which make them to differ, not in order to weaken them, but in order to appreciate and as far as possible appropriate them, to the great expansion and enrichment both of the West and of the East.

It is the more likely because the movement has been in progress for some time. In a notable article contributed to the issue for July of *The Calcutta Review* (Kegan Paul), G. F. BARBOUR, D.Phil., Esquire of Bonskeid, names one or two notable distinctions between typically Eastern and Western ways of thought, and points out certain lines of convergence which have already come into view. Two books lay before him as he wrote his article, one by an Eastern writer and one by a Western. The one book was *Sadhana: The Realization of Life*, being the Yale Lectures of Rabindranath Tagore. The other was a small volume containing three addresses by Emile Boutroux, called in French *L'Au-dela Intérieure*, in English *The Beyond that is Within*. These books draw the East and the West nearer. But, as we have said, Dr. BARBOUR tells us first of all wherein the East and the West most characteristically differ.

The simplest difference is also the most familiar. It is that Eastern thought is predominantly contemplative, while Western is predominantly practical. Dr. BARBOUR draws attention to the adverb 'predominantly,' for there are large and notable exceptions. On the side of the East he points to the practical genius of China and Japan; and how can we forget 'that little nation at the opposite extremity of the Asian continent, to which Europe owes its religion, and of which Matthew ARNOLD was thinking when he said that conduct was three parts of life'? And on the side of the West, while in the ancient, and still more in the modern, world the practical bent has been very strong, the contemplative ideal has never been wholly lost sight of and has had its periods of ascendancy, especially in the Middle Ages. Still the distinction holds good, and within its limits it is both useful and enlightening.

But there is a less familiar antithesis than that. It is the difference in the attitude of the East and the West towards the Infinite. The difference depends on the familiar difference of the contemplative and the practical already noticed. The practical mind looks with suspicion on any attempt to extend the flight of thought beyond the limits of clear definition and immediately verifiable knowledge. For the contemplative mind these limits exist only to be transcended.

To the practical mind of the Greek the 'Infinite' was an object almost of horror. It signified the unbounded, that which was without measure, and so the formless or chaotic. To the early mathematical philosophers of Greece the Infinite was the evil, the measured and symmetrical the good. The Greeks anticipated the saying of Goethe that 'he who would do great things must limit himself.' It was theirs to show that the highest beauty depends on a perfect command of the material medium and on a certain restraint in artistic expression. And in this interest they recognized the need of the work begun by Socrates, the work of criticizing the ideas which pass current in ordinary thinking. To the practical mind of the Greeks the infinite Beyond was only a distraction and a danger.

But even the Greek mind was not always practical. Greek philosophy and religion did not wholly lose the sense that concentration and 'measure' were not everything. Plato aspired after some single form of insight or knowledge in which all other knowledge is comprehended. And many a great thinker held that immediate inspiration might carry man into higher regions than the patient work of reason. Still, this is the mind of the East rather than of the West. In the words of Tagore, the ultimate truth about the external world '"lies in our apprehension of the eternal will which works in time. . . . This is not mere knowledge, as science is, but it is a perception of the soul by the soul. This does not lead us to power, as knowledge does, but it gives us joy, which is the product of the union of kindred things." But "to attain our world-consciousness, we have to unite our feeling with this all-pervasive infinite feeling." Here the Infinite is no longer an object of fear or aversion, but contact with it, nay more, the realization of the oneness of the human and the cosmic *atman* (surely one of the most daring conceptions ever reached), becomes the secret of all true understanding and of an abiding joy.'

How then are these two types of mind, so different in outlook, to be reconciled? Dr. BARBOUR does not claim that they can be reconciled. He claims only that the one may be brought to appreciate the other. He does not seem even to desire their reconciliation, in any sense that would mean coalescence. He believes that they have each a lasting value. His desire is that the East may obtain by understanding the benefit of that which is good in the practical scientific mind of the West; and perhaps still more earnestly, that the West may reap some of the riches which unquestionably attach to the more intuitive and imaginative mind of the East.

And to this end he commends the study, first of all, of M. BOUTROUX's little book. Not that M. BOUTROUX makes a deliberate and conscious attempt to understand the East. But his claim is the Eastern claim. He believes that the striving after a Beyond is an inextinguishable characteristic of the human spirit, and that it can find satisfaction only in a 'Beyond that is Within,' in the discovery of new depths in the inward and inalienable experiences of the heart of man.

Where do these experiences make themselves known? They make themselves known, says M. BOUTROUX, in Religion, in Morality, in Art, and even in Science. Dr. BARBOUR takes these four 'forms of life' separately, and considers how they point to and express the Beyond.

He takes Science first. The first great victories of modern science were gained by the strict appli-

cation of the mind to the things which can be measured, tested, and verified, and by the mental restraint which refused to look at those vague half-lights which come from the super-conscious world. But the time came when science could no longer be so restrained. Natural knowledge was found incapable of separation into measurable and conveniently limited departments. To do it justice a larger view had to be gained and subtler, bolder methods had to be used. Even in physics more and more reliance had to be placed upon mathematical theories which cannot be tested by direct observation, and in which concepts of the Infinite come to play an ever greater part. And when psychology made its researches into the phenomena of the sub-conscious—which some hold to be nearly allied to the super-conscious—a new meaning was read into the old motto: 'Yet more is to be found in me.' Thus science tends to become less positivist in tone and to rely more on hypotheses which can be verified only by the finest processes of the abstract intellect. It also reaches a fuller recognition of the infinite variety and complexity of the universe, and is thus less ready to dogmatize on the impassable limits of knowledge, more prepared to admit the impact of immeasurable influences on the mind of man.

Art, like Science, requires the discipline of concentration. 'The path of beauty lies through a certain restraint and "economy," through that perfect adaptation of form to idea, and banishment of all needless ornament which marked classical art at its best. But when this ideal has been approached, another and more sublime ideal is seen to lie beyond. The perfect expression of finite beauty no longer satisfies, and the artist strives to convey some hint or adumbration of an infinite beauty. Here, in the effort to express this transcendent idea, completeness and symmetry are no longer the one object of endeavour: it is found in the effort to express something of the "immortal longings" of the spirit of man.'

The same progress, and in the same direction, is found in the history of Morality. First there is the stage of Law and legal observance. Duties may be numerous and exacting, but they are there, clearly set forth in custom or enactment, and there is no inherent reason why the good man should not say, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' But gradually, as reflexion and self-knowledge grow deeper, a doubt arises whether goodness is exhausted by the performance of any outward law; and, as moral experience advances, this doubt becomes an assurance that the moral end cannot be thus attained, but that there is an element of the Infinite in the moral Ideal. This is the truth expressed by the Psalmist in the words, 'Thy commandment is exceeding broad'; it underlies the discovery of Paul that 'the law is spiritual'; and it has been writ large in modern ethical theory by Kant, who teaches that the ideal is so high and so exacting that it cannot be attained in this life, but implies a faith in immortality.

Finally, and in the words of M. Boutroux, as Dr. Barbour translates and quotes them, '"Religion constitutes the endeavour to amplify, to enlarge, to transfigure the very foundations of our being, through that power which enables us to participate in an existence other than our own, and which strives to embrace even the infinite, *viz.*, love. And religion does really confer on nature the power of realizing what, from the naturalistic standpoint, was unrealizable. Religion pledges, in the innermost depths of the soul, the fundamental unity of the Given and of the Beyond, and she promises the gathering inflow of the latter into the former." Nor is this true only in the region of effort and action; the great religious spirits have also expressed the same bold paradox of the relation of the finite spirit to the Infinite in terms of aspiration and desire. Such a religious paradox we find in the lines of Mary E. Coleridge:—

"Is this wide world not large enough to fill thee
Nor Nature, nor that deep man's Nature, Art?
Are they too thin, too weak and poor to still thee,
Thou little heart?

Dust art thou, and to dust again returnest,
A spark of fire within a beating clod.
Should that be infinite for which thou burnest?
Must it be God?"'

What is the most distinctive thing about Christianity? What is it that gives Christianity its pre-eminence? What is it that distinguishes it utterly and for ever from all the religions of the world? It is that the followers of its Founder love Him.

It is not that He loves them. He does love them. 'Greater love hath no man than this.' But you might claim for Buddha, you might possibly claim for Muhammad, that they loved their followers. You cannot claim, however, that their followers love them. They did not love them even when they were with them on the earth. The wonder of Christianity is that Christians love the Lord Jesus Christ after He has gone to glory, that they love Him now as passionately as they loved Him at the beginning, that they are ready to lay down their lives for Him. That is what makes Christianity unique among the religions of the earth. That is what makes it *the* religion.

The idea is expressed and elaborated at length in a sermon by the Rev. W. E. ORCHARD, D.D., to be found in the volume already referred to of *The Christian World Pulpit*. The love of the soul for Jesus, says Dr. ORCHARD (who is one of our 'broad' theologians, remember), is unique in human experience. And he hints to the psychologist, so eagerly on the outlook for new material, that he should turn his attention to it. For, as we have said, it is a passionate love. It is that or it is nothing. Dr. ORCHARD dares even to refer it to the love that is between the sexes. The reference does not ignoble love to Jesus, which is purged from every base and even natural motive, but it ennobles sexual love, for it seems to show, he says, that sexuality and religious devotion have some obscure connexion.

It is a passion. It is not the love of abstract things like truth, sincerity, or justice. It is not even a hyperbole for spiritual adoration. It is a passion. It breaks into the poetry of passion in Bernard's 'Jesu, dulcis memoria,' and in Wesley's 'Jesu, Lover of my soul.' 'It takes up the Old Testament Song of Songs and reads into what is undoubtedly a romantic poem of pure though earthly love the sweet allegory of the sacred love between the soul and its Saviour. "I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine." It seizes on David's elegy over Jonathan as expressing its own feelings. "His love to me was wonderful, passing the love of woman." It is a love which lays hold of strong, masterful men like Bernard, or Loyola, or Gordon, and makes them like little children. It sometimes provokes a scornful smile from those who cannot understand; but then so does the ridiculous behaviour of a young couple on a bus in the breast of the boisterous and unfeeling schoolboy, who nevertheless may soon be doing precisely the same thing.'

Love to Christ is that 'expulsive power of a new affection' which Chalmers declared to be the only thing which could break the tyranny of sin. 'It drew Augustine from the soft entanglements of sensuality, when all the religions and philosophies of the ancient world had failed to set him free, to mourn for ever the years in which he had not known Christ: "O beauty of ancient days, yet ever new, too late have I loved Thee." It drew Francis from the romance of chivalry, the delights of luxury, the frolics of youthful escapades, to become the knight of the Prince of Peace, the bridegroom of lady poverty, the troubadour of the lowly Jesus. It has just drawn Albert Schweitzer, the brilliant young German doctor, eminent musician, terrible theological critic, frequenter of Berlin salons, to the barbarism, the loneliness, the dangers of the fever-stricken Congo, to tell the natives the story of Jesus. Sodden drunkards, depraved criminals, worn-out *roués*, leering harlots, have become sober, honest, pure, clean, for love of Jesus.'

Thus does Dr. ORCHARD preach his sermon. We wonder sometimes if it is a sermon or a song. But as soon as we come to the 'heads'—the inevitable three—we do not doubt that the song is a true sermon. What are the three heads of it?

The first is that love to Jesus must be love to a real historical person. It is the Christ of our own experience that we love? Yes, but the Christ of our own experience is the Christ of Calvary. Can you bring a case where it is not? And when it goes back to Calvary, it finds a Christ who demanded love, love before everything else, love and nothing else.

The second head is that our love to Jesus goes back to Jesus' love for us. The question 'Lovest thou me?' (Jn 21^{17}), which is Dr. ORCHARD's text, presupposes 'as I have loved thee.' It is meaningless without that. It is impertinent. 'We love because he first loved us.' Here again Dr. ORCHARD thinks there is material for the psychologist. And for the theologian. For 'He loved me and gave himself for me'—that the follower of Jesus can say that, never having seen Jesus in the flesh, and find a response to that in the passion of his own heart's love for Jesus, is surely both psychology and theology the most profound.

The third head is that it takes us back to God. 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son'—it takes us back to that. For without that we cannot explain the love of Jesus. And without the love of Jesus to us, we cannot explain our love to Jesus, as we have already seen. It takes us back to the love of God, where the psychologist is at fault, and even the theologian is in deep perplexity. But of the fact there is no doubt whatever. It is a chain. We know that God loves us because we love Jesus. His disciples might have loved Him because they found Him as a man well worthy of their love. But we who have not seen Him in the flesh could not love Him so. We could not love Him if He were not the Son of God. We could not love Him if it were not true that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.

The Theology of Paul and the Teaching of Jesus Christ.

BY REV. J. G. JAMES, M.A., D.LITT., NEW BARNET.

WE are frequently being told that the theology of St. Paul as propounded in his Epistles is a hindrance rather than a help to those who would take the gospel of Jesus our Lord in all its directness and simplicity to their hearts. In one form or another this objection has been urged since the cry, 'The Return to Christ' was raised, and long before the Tübingen School came into being. The later developments in theology have brought it once more to the front, and we are continually hearing echoes of the same cry, that Paul corrupted the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus. Renan has thus stated the charge. 'The writings of Paul have been a stumbling-block and a peril; they have caused the chief defects in Christian theology. Paul is the father of the subtle Augustine, the arid Aquinas, the sombre Calvinist, the sour Jansenist, and the ferocious theology which predestinates to damnation. Jesus is the father of those who seek repose for their souls in the dreams of the ideal world.'

It is really worth our while to look at this contention fairly and to consider what degree of truth there is in it. In so doing we may be enabled to bring out the distinctive value of Paul's testimony and the contribution he has made to religious truth. English writers do not as a rule seem to have taken a prominent place in this vital discussion, which has been going on now for some years, but it is a subject upon which every careful

and intelligent reader of the N.T. may come to a definite conclusion for himself.

Let us start with Arnold Meyer's statement of the case. He represents our Lord in the whole of His life and teaching as being perfectly simple and consistent, propounding the deepest truths as if no one could possibly doubt or question them. He appeals to nature and to human life; He judges by the instincts of His own good life and expects others to do the same. He has no system, no definite theology, no dogma of human depravity, no plan of salvation. God is near to every one who says to Him, 'Our Father.' With joy He promises in God's name the forgiveness of sins to all who repent and He never makes the additional demand of faith in the propitiatory sacrifice of His death. The only propitiation He knows is repentance and conversion. Our Lord can feel all confidence in the simple religious soul, even in the sinner who in penitence seeks after God.

Paul's doctrines form a striking contrast to all this. He is said to have had an entirely different conception of God. Like an Oriental ruler God displays the qualities of despotism and caprice. He can approach men only through His Son. If He would love His enemies and reach out His hand to them, He requires the propitiatory shedding of blood. Christ has died and risen again in order to bring men to God, and all that He has suffered and all that He has done had been planned beforehand for the redemption of men. This is Meyer's statement of the soteriology of Paul, and he calls it a theological drama, in which Christ plays the assigned part, and thus lost and helpless souls pass on to receive the foreordained doom of condemnation or grace.

Let me further quote from Wrede. In Jesus everything aims at the personal character of the individual. In Paul the central point is a divine act, in history, but transcending history, or a complex of such acts, which imparts to mankind a ready-made salvation. Whoever believes in these divine acts—the incarnation, the death and resurrection of a celestial being—receives salvation. This to Paul, says Wrede, is the sum of religion.

These are typical statements of a certain school of thought which I imagine most of us would condemn as being, to say the least, extreme. But whilst we should shrink from endorsing such sentiments as these, there are many amongst us who question whether Paul's theology has not made it more difficult than otherwise for simple souls to accept the gospel, and who think it would be a distinct gain if men were content to leave Paul's theories severely alone, or at any rate hand them over to theologians to deal with, whilst adhering closely to the teachings of Jesus and especially to accept the revelation given by our Lord to men of God as their Father, with all that the doctrine of the Fatherhood involves. There has been a determined effort of late years to dissociate Jesus from Christianity as a system or a cult, and to lay upon Paul the responsibility of encumbering the religion of Jesus with an incubus of dogma which all succeeding ages have been engaged in unravelling and attempting to explain.

In the first place it is perhaps desirable to indicate in brief the point of contact between Paul and our Lord and to show how far the Apostle was influenced directly or indirectly by the teachings, the life, and the death and resurrection of his Master.

The question with some critics is not how much of Christ's teaching is to be discovered in Paul's Epistles and how far he was influenced by the materials that we find in the Synoptics, or in Q and Ur-Mark, but whether the Synoptics themselves were not influenced by Paulinism, inasmuch as they may have been produced later than the Epistles. On the surface of it this hypothesis looks absurd or as begging the whole question. The answer to this position seems to me to be that if the Gospels were under the influence of Paulinism at all they would have been much more so than they obviously are. This extreme position may, I think, be safely ignored in this paper.

A careful comparison of the Epistles of Paul with the Synoptics will yield probably far more striking evidences of Paul's knowledge of his Master than one might have suspected. And it is permissible to suppose that Paul passed over many of the details of our Lord's life and ministry in order to give the full significance of His death and resurrection and to explain the far-reaching and universal import of these facts for humanity and in the redemption of the race. It was surely not necessary for him to tell all that he knew about Jesus at a time when these facts would be known and accepted by all. At any rate he gave ample evidence that at least he knew that Jesus was 'a man' born of a woman, of the family of David, as wholly submissive to the Father's will, as worthy of the imita-

tion of all in that He pleased not Himself, that He instituted the last supper, that He was betrayed to death, and that on the third day He was raised from the dead and thereby declared to be the Son of God with power. This outline of facts seems to have been perfectly familiar to the apostle together with several of our Lord's specific teachings.

Nor are we to suppose that Paul claims to have received all his knowledge of Christ by direct revelation, without any kind of communication from the rest of the disciples. The facts connected with human redemption were a matter of common knowledge although the message of the gospel both for his own heart and for deliverance to the nations was doubtless received directly from the Lord Himself. None of the events connected with Jesus differed in any substantial manner from what we find recorded in the Synoptics, and we may well suppose that he received them through the ordinary channels of information.

May I be permitted to say in passing that I am not at all sure, in spite of the opinion of many eminent authorities, that Paul did not know Jesus personally in His earthly ministry? One is inclined to ask where Paul was during the course of the great tragedy which took place at Jerusalem. He was on the spot shortly afterwards and he may have witnessed and heard more than we give him credit for. I am inclined to agree with Johannes Weiss in regarding the passage in 2 Co 5^{16} as a practical admission that Paul did know Jesus after the flesh, but that he was not disposed to lay any stress upon the fact. It was rather that Christ knew *him*—knew him to be a true disciple and a new creature that really mattered. At one time he had been an enemy of Christ, but now he could claim to be an apostle equally with any of them.

Whether this position be accepted or not we may confidently affirm that Paul had every right to speak of himself as an apostle of our Lord, that he believed in Jesus Christ as the Son of God his Saviour, and that he deliberately set himself to carry out his Master's intentions, preaching the gospel of the grace of God in Christ's own spirit and with his Lord's approval. Feine very properly shows that Paul was familiar with the words and thoughts of the historic Christ, and in eschatology, the doctrine of redemption, in ethics, in his attitude towards the Law, his conception of baptism and in the Lord's Supper, he only carries to a further point of development what was already embraced or implied within the teaching of our Lord Himself. Paul would not regard himself in any other light than as a servant of Christ, as His apostle, and his one effort was to know and proclaim his Lord. Paul had grasped the full meaning of Christ's ministry, and Christ was henceforth the aim and meaning of his whole being.

Whilst Feine and many others have so clearly expressed this as being the aim and intention of the Apostle, what are we to think of the apparently well-marked differences in the theology of Paul as compared with the gospel of Jesus? May he not have been unconsciously and unwittingly under other influences, and so have been the cause of divergences of which he himself was not aware? With the best possible intentions, may he not have started trains of thought and doctrine which were not in complete harmony with the simple teaching of his Lord?

It is so often asserted that Paul was under the influence of the Rabbinical Schools of thought that it is unnecessary for me to enter into the discussion of this point with any extended reference. He declares that he was advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of his own age among his countrymen, that he was more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of his fathers, as touching the law a Pharisee, and that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. His frequent references to the words of the O.T., his quotations from the Book of Wisdom, his habit of referring to the sacred text, and his mode of reasoning are all suggestive of the Jewish Rabbi. As such he was well acquainted with the eschatological, the Messianic, and the apocalyptic ideas of his time, and was quite familiar with the doctrines that centred in the conception of the 'heavenly man.' The whole of his polemical and apologetic methods were those of the cultured and up-to-date Rabbi. This has been very largely the ground of the objection and even of reproach brought against Paul, that he has introduced far too much of the ideas and the methods of the Rabbinical Schools into the theology of the Christian religion.

Let me say what I fear will lay me open to somewhat severe criticism. I believe that Paul was far more largely under Hellenistic influences than has been generally allowed, and that he cannot be fully understood unless we give full consideration to this matter.

The very fact that Paul felt compelled on several

occasions to make such strong and emphatic declarations of his Hebrew origin and Rabbinical connexions suggests that for very good reasons he felt it necessary to do so, because in the eyes of many persons it must have seemed otherwise. It is true that he was on each occasion indicating what he had given up for Christ, but surely the Tarsian convert would have been suspect in the eyes of the stricter Pharisaical Schools, and it was necessary in consequence to state his standing in relation to the Law.

When we say that Paul was under the influence of Hellenism, what do we mean? Hellenism stood for the fusion of races, the unity of language, the union of cities and other political entities into one great harmony, and, above all, it stood for religious toleration. That Paul had every opportunity of coming under these influences and that he had some sympathy with these movements is undeniable. Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, a teacher whose breadth of vision is well known, as also the fact that he advised his pupils to study Greek literature. Tarsus, his birthplace, was the seat of the most thoroughgoing Greek culture of that day, and it affords the one example in history in which a state was ruled by the successive principals of its university. Sir W. M. Ramsay affirms that 'it was the one city which was suited by its equipoise between the Asiatic and the Western spirit to mould the character of the great Hellenistic Jew; and that it nourished in him a strong sense of loyalty and patriotism as the "citizen of no mean city"' (*The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 235).

There are abundant linguistic evidences that Paul was thoroughly conversant with the Greek literature of his day. He quotes Menander in 1 Co 15^{33}, 'Evil company doth corrupt good manners'; Aratus, or more probably Cleanthes, in Ac 17^{28}, 'We are also his offspring'; and Epimenides in Tit 1^{12}, 'Cretans are alway liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons.' His metaphors are Greek in regard to the mysteries (Col 1^{26}, Ph 4^{12}), the life of the citizen —'commonwealth, fellow-citizens' (Eph $2^{12\cdot19}$), and education—'tutor' or 'schoolmaster' (Gal 3^{24}). Paul's frequent use of the term 'conscience,' which is found so seldom elsewhere in the N.T., is quite a Stoic conception. His moral teaching takes up the best thoughts of Greek philosophy. In 1 Co 4^{8} he uses the Stoic phrases, and in Col 1 it is said by Weiss that the expressions in which Paul clothes his ideas (with regard to 'the image of the invisible God,' 'the first-born of every creature,' etc.) are entirely Greek and were borrowed from the Stoic School. The Stoics laid great stress upon the law of nature; Paul employs the term quite in harmony with their usage. He uses delicate distinctions as μορφή and σχῆμα in referring to the Person of Christ (Ph $2^{6.7.8}$), and his terms for spirit, soul, nature, etc., are thoroughly psychological. The great lyric in 1 Co 13, which has been termed the 'love-song of the Church,' has been adduced by Dr. Andrews as an instance of the strong vein of poetry which is to be found in Paul's nature. On the other hand, Canon Hicks says that it irresistibly reminds him of Aristotle's Nicomachæan Ethics! Perhaps we may reconcile these two authorities by saying that the highest flights of philosophy are indistinguishable from poetry, and all true poetry is philosophy. Several passages in Paul remind one of the Nicomachæan Ethics. The beautiful passage in 2 Co 5^{4} referring to the process of being clothed upon of immortality has an almost exact parallel in Aristotle (*N.E.* x. vii. 1177*b*, 33).

Several modern writers, particularly Schweitzer, will not allow that there is much in this contention, asserting that Paul had no first-hand acquaintance with the classic authors, but that his Hellenism came to him through the Alexandrine influences. But to me it seems highly important. We know that Jesus employed figures and parables that were decidedly Oriental and Syrian, but Paul found himself within, and had to deal with, an almost entirely different world, a world later in time and, as Asia Minor was, saturated with Greek thought. The gospel came in Jewish garb, or perhaps we should say in Oriental garb, but it had to pass through the thought-forms and the language of the Greeks, the most suitable medium, as the colloquial Greek was, for the people of that day with whom Paul had to deal. Indeed, I am inclined to go so far as to think that Paul's mystical sayings bear a far richer significance if we are permitted to read them in the thought-forms of the Platonic Idealism, with which I cannot think that Paul was wholly unacquainted. Mr. Claude G. Montefiore in his book on *Judaism and St. Paul* says that the Apostle was no Rabbinical Jew and that he did not really understand the Law, excepting in its fetters. Sir William M. Ramsay has stated the case very strongly when he asserts that it is 'unintelligible how so many distinguished

scholars in modern times can read his letters and continue to maintain that he was a narrow Jew, ignorant of Hellenic thought and training' (*The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 434).

However this may be, we may be sure that Paul owed nothing either to Hellenic thought or Rabbinical tradition for the gospel which he preached. His message was received direct from his Lord. Nevertheless he owed a great deal to both for his modes of expression and as the medium for conveying the truths of the redeeming love of God in Christ—truths that are of equal importance for Jew and Greek, barbarian and free.

At the present time a great deal is being written with the purpose of showing that early Christianity owes much of its teachings and all the principal events of our Lord's life and ministry, His death and resurrection to the influence of the cults of that age and especially to the Mystery Religions, and that Paul derived all his ideas with regard to the sacraments from these sources. There can, I think, be little doubt that the Apostle manifests a full acquaintance with these mysteries and that many of his conceptions were framed with these cults in view. So far as we know what the mystery religions actually taught, it seems that they were so crude and almost revolting, and devoid of moral force and dignity, that one wonders how they could have been compared with the gospel story or the teachings of Paul. We can understand that Paul referred implicitly to these esoteric teachings to point the contrast between them and the supreme mystery of godliness. Nor have I any sympathy with Weinel's view that we have in Paul two forms of religion, the one sacramental and the other spiritual, standing side by side, without any attempt at co-ordination. He asserts that the sacramental element was derived from the mystery religions and has become through the ages the basis and the justification for all the distinctive Catholic doctrines. If these two irreconcilable elements really exist in St. Paul's teachings, which I very much doubt, either of the two would have destroyed the other in the experience of a mind so logical and well balanced as that of the Apostle.

Now we come to what is specifically the main point of this paper. In what respects does Paulinism differ from the essential gospel truths as taught by Jesus Christ, and what do these differences involve?

Let us observe that whilst Paul received his gospel from Christ Himself and would admit no possibility of there being another Gospel, his work and mission were entirely different from those of his Master. Paul's distinctive work was to present the gospel to the nations and the Gentiles, and to show that they had the same claim to the benefits of Christ's redemptive work as the Jews. The ministry of Jesus was especially and almost exclusively confined to the chosen people. He was not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. These were to have the first chance in the offer of salvation through God's mercy and grace. But in order to do this our Lord has to take the Law, which was their especial gift and sacred deposit from God, and unfold its true and full meaning extensively and intensively. By enforcing its true inwardness and its spiritual significance He was demonstrating the fact that He had not come to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets. This was precisely what the Hebrew people, especially the scribes and the Pharisees, could not or would not apprehend, hence their rejection of a Teacher so penetrative and so searching. He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, and never said a word about abrogating or setting aside the Mosaic code. What their own Law, reverenced and almost worshipped by them, really meant was precisely that which the Hebrew nation required to know.

Paul took up the same attitude as his Master with respect to the moral claims of the Law. To him love was the fulfilling of the Law. He almost repeated the very words of Christ when he said that He had fulfilled the Law for us, and that Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believes. But what about 'the lesser breeds without the Law?' His mission, unlike that of his Master, was especially to them. The standing before God of both Jew and Gentile was by faith and not by the works of the Law. It was faith which led to obedience that was the sole ground of justification before God for the Jew no less than for the Gentile. The Jew was not saved simply because his race was included within the scope of the covenant or because he possessed the Law. It was because, as a truly spiritual child of Abraham, he exercised faith in the God of the covenant. Christ, he argued, had fulfilled and satisfied the Law for all, and therefore the Gentiles were put in precisely the same

position before God as the Jews. In Christ Jesus all are one, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. Neither Jew nor Greek could keep the Law in its entirety. All alike were condemned and included under sin in order that all might alike share in the covenant of grace. Weinel has well expressed the matter. 'The two roads to salvation are therefore descent from Abraham and justification. . . . The experience of his life showed him that the road of righteousness was an impossible one. No one can acquire so much righteousness of his own as to be quite sure of God's acquittal. Rather all men are sinners, Gentiles as well as Jews, and both are condemned by the law itself, the former by the law which is written in their own hearts, the latter by the detailed laws of Moses. All are sinners, and all therefore have come short of the heavenly glory of God. There is no righteous man; no, not one. Neither amongst the Gentiles, nor among the children of Abraham. All alike deserve to go to hell.'

All this reasoning, which appears to so many people to be unnecessarily intricate and which is regarded as a corruption of the simplicity of the gospel, was designed to make it perfectly clear for those who were outside the borders of the chosen race that they equally with the Jews could claim the benefits of Christ's redemptive work. Paul was but applying to the people of his day the scope of the profound utterance of our Lord, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.' As an answer to those who sought to re-impose the Mosaic ritual upon Gentile Christians this reasoning was most effective and conclusive. Paul was not, in his elaborate arguments in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, encumbering the gospel with speculations of his own, still less was he importing Rabbinical conceptions and limiting ideas into his message. On the contrary, he was endeavouring to demonstrate the liberty of the gospel and freedom from the Law. He was universalizing the religion of Jesus, and was indicating the basis upon which that universality rested. In giving the true universal significance to the gospel message he was merely setting forth and developing his Master's own teaching and applying it altogether in harmony with his Master's intention. He thus not only attempted to free the Christian religion from the limitations of the Jewish faith, but actually succeeded in doing so. Jesus had pronounced Woes against the lawyers of His time because they shut up the kingdom of God against men, Paul in the Galatians attacked the lawyers and also the Law because it set up a barrier between Jews and Gentiles. It is passing strange that Jesus, as He said, came to fulfil the Law, but made it so spiritual in its connotation that He was condemned for doing violence to it; on the other hand, Paul, who demonstrated that the Law was rendered of none effect, has through the centuries been accused of being a legalist!

It was the Rabbinical element in Paul that led him to narrow the scope of salvation, to oppose Jesus Christ, and to persecute the Church. When Christ had set him free from the Law, what a freedom was that! He was released for all those glorious activities which gave full play to what was best in Hellenistic aspirations, a kingdom of God with world-wide intention, that would break down the partition between the nations as well as give full religious and spiritual freedom.

Nor must it be forgotten that in all his teaching Paul was speaking directly out of his own experience to those who needed special help, the very help which Paul was commissioned to give. Dr. Andrews in his invaluable little book, *The Value of the Theology of St. Paul for Modern Thought*, has made this fact perfectly clear, and he rightly maintains that no one can understand Paul, the theologian and apostle, who does not study Paul, the man. Paul had found that his own mystic union with Christ, his Saviour and Lord, had brought to his soul the satisfaction and peace which the most punctilious observance of the Law had never afforded. And it was when he was brought face to face with the problems which arose out of the conflict with Judaizing teachers and all that was opposed to his universalistic schemes and the wideness of God's mercy that he elaborated his theological system which we find unfolded in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians.

Let us pass to the consideration on broad lines of the relations of morality and religion as set forth by Paul, as compared with those of Jesus Christ. It is here where many people conceive the greatest divergence to lie, but where, as it seems to me, the greatest harmony exists. The

contrast is often presented as that of the ethical teaching of Jesus with the speculative thought of Paul. But where is really the meeting-place of ethics and religion? Is it not in pure and holy love, love to God and man based upon the experience of God's forgiving love to us in Christ? In this respect the Apostle and his Master are absolutely at one. On the two commandments of love, said the Master, hang all the Law and the Prophets. Paul ever maintained that love is the fulfilling of the Law. The parables of our Lord emphasized the importance of love in its practical expression, and yet Paul was applying the same principle of love in quite another set of circumstances to actual cases, when he insisted that a newly found Christian liberty was not to be used in such a way as to cause a brother to stumble or to be made weak. It may be urged that Paul laid more stress upon faith in the finished work of Christ than he did upon love, whilst Jesus made love the ground of approach. Still, it must not be forgotten that Jesus always insisted upon the full acceptance of Himself in faith and His words by obedience as the necessary conditions of any spiritual blessing. Paul's great Ode to Love, in which faith and hope are subordinated to love, to say nothing of other great spiritual gifts, could never have been written by one who was hide-bound with Rabbinical lore or theological pre-occupations. Love was for him the life-blood of all morality and religion, it overleaped all the barriers of time and place and circumstance, it was 'the more excellent way.' This teaching was the transcript and reflex of his own life and character; one has only to think of what he suffered in the interests of others and for his Master's sake to realize the truth of this statement. As Weiss has pointed out, the emphasis laid upon love indicates that in this respect Paul understood Jesus 'inwardly, deeply, and correctly.' Those who speak of the ethical teaching of Jesus so as to imply that Paul had no ethical teaching must surely have forgotten Ro 14, in which the Sermon on the Mount is brought to bear upon the specific needs of the Romans of Paul's day. The ethic of Paul, as Weiss has so fully and admirably shown, is an invaluable contribution to the totality of Christian morality. Men are taught that they must not retaliate; it is better to suffer wrong than to inflict it. The non-resistance of one who loves God and his fellows is inspired by a divine and fine contempt for the powers of evil. Men are to bear the misfortunes of life in a brave and cheerful spirit, anxious for nothing but to do the will of God, and committing all else to the ordering of the Heavenly Father's wisdom and love. They are to please not themselves, but their brother for his good to edification. All this is in complete harmony with the Master's own spirit. Where minor points of difference occur it will be noticed that Paul was dealing with a different set of conditions; and it must ever be borne in mind that Paul had the task of organizing Christian communities, whilst his Master was dealing with individuals and was inaugurating the kingdom.

I can quite believe that some of my readers may ask why I have not dealt with two of the distinctive doctrines of Paul, viz. original sin and predestination. It must be said in reply that either one of these would take more than the whole of the space that I have at my disposal for this paper. With regard to the former, one need hardly do more than point out that, whatever view of the subject we adopt, original sin takes its place in Paul's great argument that the whole race needs redemption as a race, and that none can stand before God on the ground of merit. As therefore the race needs to be redeemed, Christ is a perfect Saviour by offering a cosmic sacrifice and propitiation by His death. Likewise with regard to predestination, assuming that it is true that God's people are the chosen and elected, yet, as Paul argues, that very election is grounded in the mercy and the free grace of God. So that for all the nations, the Gentiles as well as the Hebrews, the gift of salvation is freely bestowed, and the new covenant of grace may include all. It should not be forgotten that the germs of both these doctrines are found in the teaching of the Master Himself.

There is, of course, one essential difference between Paul and Jesus, and that was precisely the difference which we should expect to find between the disciple and his Master, the sinner and his Saviour. That is the spirit of reverence, dependence, and faith in Christ which runs through the whole of Paul's life and teaching. With all his fulness of utterance and with all the grateful adoration of the Apostle for his Lord, we cannot but feel that the underlying thought is too deep for expression, feelings that broke through language

and escaped, when he sought to convey to others all that Christ meant for him.

It is here, as it seems to me, that the thought-forms of the Platonic philosophy came to his help, although Paul was expressing what far transcended the Platonic or any other philosophy. More than all that Plato meant in his doctrine of ideals we have in Philippians, where Paul sets His Lord before him as the prize, the mark, and the goal of the whole of his vital activity. Christ was to him the reality of the personal Ideal, to whose form and likeness he had to approximate more and more. Christ was to him his highest good, the purpose and aim as well as the significance of his whole being. He longed to be found in Him, not having his own righteousness, but the righteousness which is of God through faith. His life was hid with Christ in God, and yet he could say, 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' Paul felt that his vital interest, his true being, was not in himself, the actual sinful Paul, but in his Ideal, his Lord. In this mystic union of Paul with Christ there was no Pantheistic tendency, no blending or confusion of the centres of personal entity, but it was a conception of the Christ as the Ideal, who, whilst being the end and the fulfilment of his soul's aspiration and the object of his faith, was being formed in him, and who was shaping and moulding his life and character, and upon whose personality, death and resurrection, his whole life was being formed and modelled. Thus could he say that his life was to be found in Christ and Christ in him. This is not the *unio mystica* of the mystery religions, but an ethical union, as Professor Pringle Pattison has said, constituted by love and mediated through faith. Whilst the form may have been Platonic, the content was the living Gospel of his Lord, nay, the very Christ Himself. Whilst the revelation came to his soul through the immediacy of faith he acknowledged that he owed the whole of his message to Jesus the crucified, who was still living in all His resurrection power as his Saviour and his Lord.

The theology of Paul, therefore, was intended for distinctly practical purposes in regulating, instructing, and organizing the Churches which he had formed or in which he was specially interested. It was not an attempt to formulate in precise terms the dogmas of the Christian Church, and yet it has been the basis of all theological thought in the ages since. Moreover the theology of Paul has always been associated with every great movement of the Church in Evangelical fervour and enthusiasm. One has only to claim for Paul a deeper study of his doctrines in the light of his own personal experience to discern that he was in spirit nearer to his Lord than one might have thought. 'He who would understand Paul aright,' one has said, 'should seek to find him at the height of his ideal, and then he would discover that he is not far distant from Jesus.' He enlarged upon and sought to explain the redemptive work of Christ, its far-reaching scope and its universality. He indicated its bearing upon the needs of humanity, man's sinfulness and his capacity for knowing and serving God in Christ and finding life eternal. But in all this he was expanding and interpreting our Lord's own declaration that He came to give His life a ransom for many, and all the doctrines of redemption centred in that supreme act of self-sacrifice which in reality had a larger content of truth than all the doctrines and dogmas could elucidate. This was Paul's theme, and to the exposition of it he devoted his whole life until the time came for him to lay that life down for the Master's sake and to go to be with his Lord, and receive the crown of righteousness.

The leading characteristic of Paul's teaching was that he owed all that he was to Christ, his Lord. Christ in His perfect holiness, Paul through Christ's redemptive work, Christ in His eternal Sonship, Paul through the grace of God, Christ as the manifestation of the infinitely holy love of the Father, Paul by means of that unspeakable love that chose and singled him out, Christ as the Saviour and Lord, Paul the Apostle, were infinitely removed the one from the other, and yet at the same time were in vital relation and perfect union. Meyer has splendidly expressed it when he said, '"Back to Jesus from Paul," does not express what is required of us, but our motto should be, "Back through Paul to Jesus and God," and our conclusion, "Paul just one who points the way to Jesus and God."'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Hand.

'The hand of man.'—Gn 9^5.

1. *Hands.*—I have a very distinct recollection of three pairs of hands. They were the hands of my brothers. Long ago, when we played together, I never noticed that there was any great difference between the hands of the four of us. It was not till we grew up, and each had his own distinctive characteristics, that the difference struck me. I can imagine I see them now; and if they were held up amongst twenty other pairs, I believe I could pick them out. You are not grown up yet, so I don't suppose you have thought about hands and what they mean. But your mother knows ever so much about yours. I've seen a very proud mother holding a baby boy; and when he closed his wee hand firmly, she said, 'See! that's going to be a man with some force about him.' It is really very delightful to hear mothers on this subject.

But, while you have never given the matter a thought, you must have noticed certain things. For instance, the hands of a labouring man are not in the least like those of a watchmaker, or an engraver, or of a person who writes all day. And some of you little ones, who get your faces washed, know that there are very hard hands, as well as nice soft ones. A real nurse's hand is both strong and soft. A doctor's may be the same, but it must also have a very delicate touch. Then perhaps some of the boys have seen men who had tremendous strength in their hands. There is a well known cartoon of the German Emperor, called the 'Mailed Fist.' He is holding up a clenched hand covered with iron. But it was just a boy of whom we are told in the Bible that he killed both a lion and a bear. How strong his hand must have been! It was delicate as well; for—think of it—that boy could play the harp most beautifully. Sculptors have often tried to represent him in marble, sometimes as a boy, oftener as a man. But with their cold dead medium, they could never show us the living hand of the Bible. Read the story of David again to-night, and you will, in your mind, have a picture of that hand, comforting the unhappy king with music. Then, picture it to yourselves clenched as he led on his army to battle, and again, covering his face as he wept for Absalom. With us older people, David's hand is oftenest remembered as having something of the little child in it; for when it was lifted up before God, it was to say, 'I've done wrong: forgive me' ('I have sinned . . . take away the iniquity of thy servant').

2. *Her hand.*—You remember the first hand you ever noticed? It was your mother's, wasn't it? You know every line and mark upon it—the first finger of the left hand, with the marks that the needle has made, the knuckles—perhaps they tell of hard work—and the palm. You never saw a hand quite like it. It can do all sorts of things—brush your hair, iron the frocks for the picnics, perhaps even scrub the floors. There have been men who, when they were away in foreign countries, loved to think of that hand. It comforted them. And there have been others who could not bear to think of it. They had done what was wrong, and felt they could not look their mother in the face.

3. *My hand.*—Now, there's your own hand—'my hand.' It has a little history written on it already. The mark of that cut you got two years ago, and that big joint on your forefinger—it was caused by a chilblain. But these are just trifles. Speaking seriously; what is your hand for? For service—for doing things with. Who is its master or mistress? You are. No wonder, then, that the hand is mentioned in the Bible oftener than almost anything else; for the Bible is just written about men, women, and boys, and girls; what they do, and how they are rewarded or punished. It is, in fact, a great book about the hands. Think of this yourselves. Each of you has a pair. They may, at your bidding, do either good or evil. *They are really yourselves.* If you have a careless mind, then, according to the Bible, your hand is the same. It speaks of 'the hand of the diligent,' the 'slack hand,' 'clean hands,' the hand that is 'cruel' and the hand 'stretched out to help.' There's a hand I should like to speak to the girls about. It is an old-fashioned, but a very beautiful one—the hand of the virtuous woman. 'She stretcheth out her hand to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy.' I wonder, girls, if any of you

have begun to learn drawing. It is when you try to draw a woman's hand that you discover how beautiful it may be. I remember once seeing a letter written to a girl by one who loved her very, very much. The only sentence in it that I can recall now is, 'I cannot think of that pretty little hand ever doing anything but kind actions.'

4. *His hand.*—A few years ago I went to see an interesting church with a lady. We had been out a walk together and had talked to each other just about ordinary everyday things. But in the church was a picture of Jesus Christ. As soon as my companion saw it, in deepest reverence she knelt down to pray. And a feeling like that comes when one tries to think of 'His hand.'

We hesitate to speak, lest we spoil the marvellous story of the New Testament. From beginning to end it is a story of love. 'Jesus put forth his hand'; 'He laid his hands on them' (you remember that was when the little children were brought to Him); 'He took her by the hand.'

I know what many of you thought of when I came to this part of our sermon. My dear children, it was the *hands* of men that raised the cross. But there were those whose eyes had been opened to know Jesus Christ. They loved Him, and were His devoted followers. Between them and their Master there was a beautiful friendship, deepened no doubt during the days following the resurrection, for then there was an element of sorrow in it. Even in the joy of seeing Him again, they must have felt sad, for 'he shewed unto them his hands.' If you heard of a life like the life of Jesus Christ being lived now, wouldn't you, like young soldiers, be ready with your right hands to take an oath of allegiance to him who lived it? And were your fathers and mothers but willing, I believe you would follow such a man to the ends of the earth. You can enter the service of Jesus Christ now.

The Carpenter's Shop.

'Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?'—Mt $13^{55.\ 56}$.

1. Carpentry is a very ancient trade. Long before the time of Christ there were joiners and carpenters in Egypt, Assyria, Persia, and Greece, who could do beautiful work and had invented a variety of tools, as we can tell by those which have been discovered. Carpenters are sometimes mentioned in the Bible. The prophet Isaiah describes a carpenter who cuts down a tree, and makes the figure of a man out of it for an idol, which he falls down and worships, and of the rest of the tree he makes a fire to warm himself, and to bake his bread and cook his meat on. His 'heart is deceived' so that he does not see how foolish it is to make a god out of the piece of wood which he burns. We see the folly of it, but we must remember that it is done still in many places.

Then there were the carpenters who worked for king Solomon. He got them from the king of Tyre, because they were more clever than his own. King Hiram gave him wood as well, cedar trees and fir trees, and the carpenters, along with those of king Solomon, made the wood-work of the Temple and of the king's palaces. All the inside of the Temple was lined with cedar wood, carved with flowers and cherubim and palm trees, and the doors were made of olive wood carved in the same way, and then it was all covered over with gold. And in Solomon's own palace there was one hall which had rows upon rows of pillars all made of cedar, so that it was called the House of the Forest of Lebanon. All this was the work of the carpenters.

In our own land we find that the ancient fraternity of English carpenters existed in the time of Edward IV., while those of the 'joiners and ceilers,' whose motto is the honest one, 'Join truth with trust,' were not incorporated until the reign of Elizabeth. Their old hall, near London Wall, one of the few large city buildings which escaped destruction during the Great Fire of London, still has in it some curious Biblical frescoes representing the first workers in wood: Noah humbly listening to the Lord's commands concerning the building of the Ark, and in another part of the same picture are shown the patriarch's three sons all busy at the task; we have king Josiah directing the repairs of the Temple, or Joseph working in his carpenter's shop at Nazareth, the crowd wondering concerning the new teacher —'Is not this the carpenter's son?'—the subject of each picture being made clear by black-letter inscriptions.[1]

2. Not only in temples and palaces, however, but wherever people live, workers in wood are needed. Houses must have doors, and fishermen must have boats, and the boats must have masts and oars. In Palestine the ploughs and yokes and goads and other agricultural implements were made of wood, and were the work of the carpenter.

[1] C. L. Matéaux, *Wonderland of Work*, 146.

And if it was a humble trade, it was considered an honourable one, and a carpenter could be chosen as High Priest.

The carpenter in Palestine was not a man who merely made articles in a workshop, but one who went about the district repairing doors and windows, going sometimes as far as the lake, twenty-five miles off, to repair boats and make masts and oars. He also made yokes for the oxen, tables, chairs, and wooden utensils, so that there would be hardly a house in which Jesus would not be known by virtue of His work.[1]

3. This then was the kind of work that Joseph did. It was not building and carving kings' palaces. It was common work for common people, in a little country place. And it was this work that our Lord learned to do, and did, till He was thirty years of age. But however plain the work might be, we may be sure it would be perfectly done. When the time came for Him to stop His work, and He came to John the Baptist to be baptized, a voice from heaven said, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' We may be sure that the work of all those years was always what God could look on with pleasure. He could never be pleased with bad work. So our Lord, doing simple tasks, unknown by those He worked for, taught us the dignity of work, and made all honest work honourable.

We are accustomed to speak of our work as a vocation or calling. 'Let every man,' says St. Paul, 'abide in that calling wherein he was called.' Some are called to be servants, some to be masters, some to administer five talents, others one; but every man is as truly called of God to his life-work as the painter to paint, or the physician to heal. What counts in God's sight is less the actual work we do than the way in which we do it. What we make, makes us. The slight gauze on which the mantle of the incandescent light is formed flares away in a moment, but the firmer fabric wrought on it by chemical agents will be luminous for a thousand hours. So the things we make in the world pass quickly away, but the motives with which we do them go to make us for better or worse. If you do your work perfunctorily, you become a hypocrite; if you work carelessly, you become a sloven; if you work only to please men, the sense of God will die out of your life. At the close of life's working day we shall be rewarded, not according to the results we have accomplished, but according to the faithfulness with which we have done the work God hath given us to do.

In all He did He was an artist, not an artisan. You ask the difference? I will tell you. The artist is he who strives to perfect his work, the artisan he who seeks only to get it done. The artist would fain finish too, but with him it is to 'finish the work God has given him to do.' It is not how great a thing we do, but how well we do the thing we have to do, that puts us in the noble brotherhood of artists.[2]

4. And Jesus' work as a carpenter was not only good in itself, but it helped to fit Him for His public work later on. In His ministry He had to walk long distances, over bad roads, under a burning sun. He was often surrounded and followed by people who wished to hear Him, or to be healed of sickness, till He had no leisure to rest or even to eat, and after a long day of work for others He passed the night in prayer. It was His hard, simple life in His early years that made His body strong to endure all that fatigue, and that gave Him sympathy with all weary toilers. If He had been a learned Rabbi in Jerusalem He could never have understood the feelings and the needs of poor people in the same way.

The little children knew Him, and had often gone to play about His shop and never received an unkind word. Many a poor old body who had come to pick up the chips and shavings said, 'Oh yes; we know Him right well, the Carpenter.' Everything about Him made Him one with the people. His very disciples were simple fishermen who by their presence encouraged the people to draw near. He wore the dress of the people, not that of the Rabbis, and told His disciples not to put on the long robes of the Pharisees. His look and tone and manner were all simple and homely.

There is a pretty story told by Martin Luther of a good bishop who earnestly prayed that God would reveal to him something more than the Bible tells about the childhood of Jesus. At last he had a dream. He dreamed that he saw a carpenter working with saws and hammers and planes, just like any carpenter, and beside him a little boy picking up chips. Then came a sweet-faced woman in a green dress, and called them both to dinner, and set porridge before them. All this the bishop saw in his dream, himself standing behind the door, that he might not be perceived. Then the little boy, spying him, cried out, 'Why does that man stand there? Shall he not eat of our porridge with us?' Thereupon the bishop awoke. This charming little dream-fable carries with it a beautiful and an important truth. It is the

[1] A. Schofield, *Where He Dwelt*, 107.

[2] W. A. Newman Hall, *Do Out the Duty*, 3.

carpenter's child who wanted all the world to share His porridge with Him who has conquered the heart of humanity.[1]

6. The people of Nazareth were offended at being taught by a carpenter. Very likely He had worked for many of them and they knew His parents and His brothers and sisters. We might not have known better. We are apt to despise poor people and people we know, or think we know—for we really know nobody as God knows them—and we should remember that, where the people of Nazareth saw only the village carpenter, God saw His beloved Son in whom He was well pleased.

They said, 'The carpenter's son.' To me,
No dearer thing in the Book I see,
For He must have risen with the light,
And patiently toiled until the night.
He too was weary when evening came,
For well He knoweth our mortal frame,
And He remembers the weight of dust,
So His frail children may sing and trust.

We often toil till our eyes grow dim,
Yet our hearts faint not because of Him.
The workers are striving everywhere,
Some with a pitiful load of care.
Many in peril upon the sea,
Or deep in the mine's dark mystery,
While mothers nor day nor night can rest;
I fancy the Master loves them best.

For many a little head has lain,
On the heart pierced by redemption's pain.
He was so tender with fragile things,
He saw the sparrow with broken wings.
His mother, loveliest woman born,
Had humble tasks in her home each morn,
And He thought of her the cross above,
So burdened women must have His love.

For labour, the common lot of man,
Is part of a kind Creator's plan,
And he is a king whose brow is wet
With the pearl-gemmed crown of honest sweat.
Some glorious day, this understood,
All toilers will be a brotherhood.
With brain or hand the purpose is one,
And the master Workman, God's own Son.[2]

Chinese Sidelights upon Scripture Passages.

By the Rev. W. Arthur Cornaby, Wusueh, China.

II.

The Portal of the Scriptures.—In the forefront of the Hebrew Scriptures we find a grandly decisive utterance ('In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth') which serves as a great coupling text to two distinct, yet related, accounts of Creation: (*a*) in general and (*b*) of mankind—a literary form that is suggestive of the Greek letter Π. And, further, in the account of Creation in general (Gn $1^{2\text{-}31}$ $2^{1\text{-}3}$) we find the same literary form—three progressive statements being set over against three other progressive statements, which are alike crowned with a final statement of completion. Is it likely that this doubly occurring literary form is a mere coincidence?

Where Western nations are mostly content with a 'front door' (larger perhaps than the average) as a chief entrance to public buildings, the ancient nations gave great prominence to portals. In Greece and Rome the portico of a temple was generally its chief architectural part. And we of west Europe have unconsciously followed a venerable and wide-spread custom in the erection of our Marble Arch, Arc de Triomphe, and the like. From the Egyptian pylons to the Japanese torēs, there are unnumbered instances of the portal being, in and of itself, a highly important object in ancient architecture. In China (besides monumental arches) stone portals are erected to mark important precincts. On the river front, before a chief city gate, we often find a separate portal, inscribed with parallel mottoes on the two uprights, and a general motto on the lintel. And is it by accident that the literary form of the great opening-portion of the Scriptures so closely resembles such a portal?

Our knowledge of pre-Babylonian Chaldea, and of the Babylonian realm under Hammurabi and his successors, is singularly full as regards many of its manners and customs, but somewhat lacking as regards the specific architecture of those times. Yet, from all analogy, we may gather that portals were much in evidence there; and that those portals were often inscribed with mottoes—from the fact that Moses commanded the descendants of Abraham to write sacred mottoes 'upon the doorposts of their houses and upon their gates' (Dt 6^{9}). He may possibly have had an Egyptian precedent in mind. But the genius of Hebrew motto-writing (as in the Proverbs), and poetic composition generally, follows the lines of parallelism and antithesis, as among the early Chaldeans, and the ancient and modern Chinese. And his exhortation is likely to have had a Chaldean precedent also.

[1] H. Halsey, *The Beauty of the Lord*, 220.
[2] Myra Goodwin Plantz.

From the vantage-ground of an East Asian land of ancient survivals it seems more than possible, then, that the Elohist poem of Creation was intentionally based on the model of an inscribed portal—whether by the Hebrew writer himself, or by some more ancient Chaldean writer, from whose composition it may have been revised and edited.

But whether intentionally thus written or not, this poem of Creation (Gn $1^{2\text{-}31}$ $2^{1\text{-}3}$) coincides in its structure with the literary decoration of a stone portal, or gate of entrance, from of old until modern days throughout East Asia, the essentials of which are a strophe, an anti-strophe, and then a sentence to couple or crown both.

On the one side of this Scripture portal we find[1] the creation (1) of light, (2) of air and water, (3) of land, and the climax of inanimate nature. On the other side we find the creation (1) of lights, (2) of life in air and water, (3) of life on land, and the climax of animate nature. And on the lintel, the Divine repose of accomplished enterprise.

It is through this Porta Triumphalis of sublime achievement that we enter the sacred precincts of Divine workmanship upon the less tractable chaos of human passion, cheered by the hope that even this age-long enterprise will in the end be crowned with a like rest, for God and for man (cf. Is 40^{28} $42^{1,4}$).

The Number Seven.—The numerical sign of perfection in China is usually ten, as in Egypt of old.[2] All the more striking, then, is the fact that in that ancient book of divination, the *Classic of Changes*, which so fascinated Confucius that he longed for fifty more years in which to study it, there are passages to the effect that 'the revolution of all things is completed every seventh day.'

This primeval division of time into periods of seven days is traced in China, as in old Chaldea, to the 'seven regulators'—the Sun, Moon, and Venus, Jupiter, Mercury, Mars, Saturn (which 'five stars' are conceived as 'regulating' the 'five elements': metal, wood, water, fire, earth).

There is a weird parable of Creation given in the works of the Taoist mystic Chuang Tzu (third and fourth century B.C.):

> 'The *Yang* lord (of brightness or radiation), he of the southern seas, and the *Yin* lord (of obscurity or receptivity) of the northern seas often met in the realms of the lord of the centre, whose name was Chaos. He always treated them well, and so they consulted together to find some means of recompense, saying: "Every man has two organs of sight, and two of hearing, one of taste and one of smell. Chaos alone has none of these. Let us try and pierce some for him." Accordingly the first day they succeeded in piercing the first aperture' (*i.e.* giving him *light*), 'but by the time that *seven days* had elapsed, Chaos died.'

Metaphor and Myth.—Over against the Hebrew metaphor רָחַף, 'to brood' (Gn 1^{2}), we have the Chinese conception of a primordial egg, pictorially represented as divided in its substance by a curved line, on one side of which it is black, and on the other white, from the incipient Yin and Yang principles.

All ancient writing was once pictorial. And while the Hebrew word בָּרָא, 'to create,' seems to have the root idea of cutting or carving out, the corresponding Chinese word *ts'ang* (or *ch'uang*) contains the 'knife radical' and has the same root meaning. This might hardly be worth a passing reference but for the fact that, in China, the verbal metaphor anciently grew into a full-fledged myth of one P'an Ku, an impossible stone mason who, being evolved in the midst of a highly solidified chaos, set to work with his hammer and chisel hewing out heaven and earth (as recorded, if somewhat apologetically, in Chinese history). His breath became the wind, his voice the thunder, his left eye the sun, his right eye the moon, his blood the rivers, his hair the trees and herbs, his flesh the soil, his sweat the rain, and the parasites which infested his body the human race! A crude instance this, of the misuse of metaphor, which, in a more refined form, has not been entirely absent from some of the great scriptural or doctrinal controversies of Christendom.

Literary Parallelism.—The first of the ancient Odes, or folk songs of China (dating from about Solomon's time, and edited by Confucius in

[1] The parallelism in the Elohist account of Creation was pointed out by Professor Elmslie in the *Contemporary Review*, December 1887.

[2] Hence, while the Israelites were yet under Egyptian influence we read of ten plagues, Ten Commandments, and, as late as the days of Eli, 'ten sons' (1 Sam 1^{8}).

the fifth century B.C.), exemplifies the literary parallelism which marks the average Hebrew poetical composition, and indeed much resembles a passage in the Canticles:

> Waking and sleeping he sought her,
> Sought her but found her not;
> Waking and sleeping he cherished her,
> Long, long he thought upon her,
> Turning from side to side.

The Chinese, with their monosyllabic words, and mosaic-like character blocks, have developed their scheme of literary parallelism to an extreme of refinement. In one of the best poems of China, by the painter-poet Wang Wei (d. 750 A.D.), the five-word lines translate almost literally thus:

> Declining day-beams light each rustic home,
> Along the lanes the flocks returning come;
> The aged men their herdsman sons await,
> And staff-supported stand beside the gate;
> The wild birds fly o'er fields of ripening corn,
> The silkworms sleep on mulberry twigs half-shorn;
> With shouldered hoe the farmers homeward stride,
> To spend in social chat the eventide.

The general scheme of parallelism in the whole will be noted, but in the original of lines five and six there is also a complete parallelism of character to character, as well as the real antithesis of wild wings in motion and of worms in repose, and the further apparent antithesis of fulness and scarcity (crops and tree-twigs), with the actual blending of felicitous thought. This is fine art, such as is prized in mottoes for doorways and guest-rooms. And not a few Hebrew couplets are found to have a basis of very exact parallelism. Thus Ps $126^{5.6}$ might be read in terser form, as though in Chinese:

> Going forth, sorrowing, scattering good seed;
> Coming home, rejoicing, gathering much grain.

Fulfilment of the Law.

By the Rev. W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D., Preston.

Our Lord announced that He did not come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil. What exactly did He mean?

To 'fulfil the prophets' is a phrase used extensively by Matthew, who evidently meant, To match prediction by accomplishment. The other half of the phrase might by analogy be understood, To match an order by obedience. But it has received much less attention, and lately it has been quoted in very illegitimate connections, with untenable senses put on it, to support positions open to grave challenge. Because of the practical proposals made, it seems desirable to examine the Biblical basis of these proposals, and to inquire rigorously into the meaning of the phrase, To fulfil the Law.

The Law in question is the Jewish Law, and nothing else. Our Lord's horizon in most of His prophetic ministry was national, and Matthew emphasizes this aspect of it. The Sermon on the Mount was spoken to Jews, and they attached very definite meanings to the terms "Law" and "Prophets."

The inquiry therefore is as to the verb Fulfil, which is used ninety times in the N.T., while a noun derived from it, generally translated Fulness, occurs seventeen times. We may compare these passages and derive from them the various meanings of the Greek verb, then test which meaning best suits the present passage. The result may be checked by a wider induction from the N.T. as to the actual relation of our Lord to the Law, and by another inquiry as to the present status of the Law.

1. The Usage of the Word Fulfil.

To Fulfil is literally to Fill full; as a valley is levelled up with earth and stones from a mountain, for a highway; as a net is filled with fish, or a measure with corn; as a hole in a coat is filled with a patch, or baskets are filled with fragments of bread and fish. By a slight extension from material things, as a house is pervaded with the presence of the Spirit, or Jerusalem with teaching about the Lord.

The literal meaning is rare, and it is the derived meanings that need to be examined. We may pass instances of the active voice, men being filled with joy, sorrow, knowledge, comfort, unrighteousness; and may study passages speaking of some object being fulfilled. These fall into three groups, which are typically Lucan, Johannine, Pauline.

Luke habitually uses the word with the general sense, Complete and End. Four times he speaks of times being ended, Lk 21^{24}, Ac $7^{23.30}$ 9^{23}; once of sayings, Lk 7^{1}; once of events, Ac 19^{21}; four times of a piece of service, Lk 9^{31}, Ac 12^{25} 13^{25} 14^{26}. The same sense is found also at Mk 1^{15}, Jn 7^{8}. The corresponding noun, never used by Luke, signifies a Completed number, Ro $11^{12.25}$, a Completed time or times, Gal 4^{4}, Eph 1^{10}.

In the Fourth Gospel we find the phrase, 'Joy is fulfilled' (3^{29} 15^{11} 16^{24} 17^{13}); and the same idea is in Ph 2^{2} 4^{19}, 2 Th 1^{11}, though in two of these cases the verb is active. The sense here is to Complete and Satisfy. The derived noun has a kindred meaning of Satisfying Completeness in Jn 1^{16}, Col 1^{19} 2^{9}, Eph 1^{23} 3^{19} 4^{13}, Ro 15^{29}.

The way Paul generally uses the verb is closely akin to this, to Complete and Satisfy, to Complete and Discharge a duty. At Ro 15^{19} he says he has discharged his duty of preaching throughout a district; at Col 4^{17} he bids Archippus discharge his duty; at Col 1^{25} he declares his commission to be the complete carrying out of God's word. Thrice he deals with the very idea before us, Fulfiling the Law; at Gal 5^{15} the meaning is that the whole Law is completely carried out in one maxim; at Ro 8^{4}, the requirement of the Law may be completely discharged in us; at Ro 13^{8}, he that loves his neighbour has completely obeyed the Law. And the noun expresses the same thought, Ro 13^{10}, Love is the satisfaction of the Law.

Outside the first Gospel we thus find simply two shades of meaning: Complete and End, Complete and Satisfy. We have now to test which is more suitable here.

The verb occurs in Matthew seventeen times, twice meaning literally, Fill. Thirteen instances refer to the accomplishment of predictions, more akin to the second shade. There remain two cases, Fulfil all righteousness, Fulfil the Law; and presumably in kindred phrases the meaning is the same. Our Lord certainly did not mean that He was bringing righteousness to an end, we therefore take the second meaning. He told John that He had come to satisfy the requirements of righteousness; He told the people that He had come to satisfy the Law.

Thus we are guided to the sense, Respect, Discharge, Obey completely. This is arrived at by strict induction from every passage in the N.T. where the verb and its derived noun occur. In the LXX the same meaning is found at Ps $20^{4.5}$.

It is surprising to find this meaning summarily rejected by Hort (*Jud. Christianity*, 15): 'We may safely neglect the meaning which perhaps comes first to mind, that of personal obedience or performance, as we speak of the fulfilment of an injunction.' No reason is vouchsafed for this curt dismissal, and the next sentence is more astonishing: 'Its true meaning answers much more exactly to that destroying or undoing to which it is here formally opposed.' That is to say, our Lord was drawing a distinction without a difference! and was explaining away a fear that was well founded! Presently the text is thus interpreted (page 18): The Law 'remained binding within its own limits, but it was to be filled out and deepened by a new spirit, the prohibition of murder, for instance, being fulfilled by the prohibition of anger against a brother.' To this explanation, which carries with it a train of implications from which we dissent, we oppose the simple fact that the word Fulfil never bears any such meaning elsewhere.

The meaning at which we have arrived is fully accepted by Archdeacon Allen in his commentary; to Reaffirm and Carry out in detail. It agrees with the other part of the sentence, which will then mean: I am come to match the orders of the Law and the predictions of the Prophets by punctilious performance. But Mr. Allen also notes, what is often overlooked, that these verses do not explain the discussion of the Law which follows. Perhaps Hort's refusal to accept what he owned to be the obvious meaning, was due to the tacit idea that v.[17] is a text, vv. [21-48] are illustrations of the text. Another connexion avoids the difficulty, and shows a progress of thought, as to the Law, and as to the authority of Christ. 'I am not here to repeal the Law as lawgiver, nor to defy it as rebel, but to obey it as under law. Till I have obeyed it, it stands in all respects. As lawgiver, I raise for the future a higher standard of conduct; the Law is inadequate in some respects, and absolutely bad in others. My comprehensive maxim is, Do as you would be done by. This contains everything good in the Law and in the teaching of the Prophets. To appreciate it is easy, to perform it is needful; for I am more than obedient to the Law, I am the lawgiver.'

Such a movement of thought is coherent in itself, and is congruous with other teaching. It removes

all temptation to read back into the word Fulfil various shades of meaning suggested by the drastic criticisms of the Law in the rest of the chapter. It leaves us free to adhere to the meaning which 'comes first to mind,' and which contents such lexicographers as Cremer and Thayer. But it raises theological questions which are too often evaded by understanding the word otherwise. And to these we must advance.

2. Our Lord's Obedience to the Law.

The conclusion from usage may now be confirmed from an examination of what our Lord actually did in relation to the Law. He obeyed it in every respect, and was careful to impress upon others their habitual disobedience and His obedience.

He told the lepers whom He healed, what the Law required of them. He appealed to it in argument repeatedly, even while asserting that no one really kept it (Jn 7^{19}). More than once He invited any accusation that He was breaking it, and when murmurs were heard as to His disregard of the Sabbath, He defended Himself not by repudiating the Sabbath-law, but by quoting precedents and arguing that He was still keeping it, in spirit and in letter. On one dramatic occasion, when the death-penalty prescribed in the Law was not consonant with public feeling, and the scribes tried to entrap Him into contradicting it, He overcame the difficulty by inducing them to waive their accusation. He defended another precept as to sexual morality, and even showed that He was prepared to go further. And when the fictions of the lawyers had contrived an evasion of another precept, He plainly accused them of rejecting the commandment of God. Such incidents illustrate how they were destroying the Law, He was upholding it.

On His last evening with the disciples, He reflected that He had accomplished what He was entrusted with; this of course surveys much more, but it includes contentment with having kept the Law. Next morning one charge against Him was that by their Law He ought to die. If indeed He had 'made Himself' the Son of God, He would not have denied the application of the Law. But His closing breath reiterated the claim of the supper room, and announced that it was finished. Again, whatever more was finished, His life of obedience to the Law was over. Born under the Law, He had redeemed those who were under the Law. All things were accomplished; the Law had not been destroyed by Him, it had been completely carried out and satisfied.

Thus the events in our Lord's life confirm our interpretation of His utterance: He said that He would obey the Law; He did. But another question soon forced itself on the attention of His followers, who had heard such an utterance as 'The Law and the Prophets until John.' What was the binding force of the Law after His obedience? All was accomplished; did it hold any longer in any jot or tittle?

3. Our Lord's Ending of the Law.

We have seen that the word Fulfil has as one shade of meaning, To Complete and Finish; does that shade also attach to our Lord's utterance? When He obeyed it, did He thereby exhaust it? Our English laws as to contracts easily suggest as much. A contract may be found very onerous, and a man may be tempted to repudiate it or to declare himself bankrupt rather than fulfil his side; but if he does honourably fulfil it, and the other party fulfils his side, then the contract has no further binding force: being fulfilled, it cannot be enforced again. The question is of real and present importance; is the Law still binding on a Jew?

In the Acts and the Epistles we can see this question being raised, and successive answers being given. The earliest converts from the Jews still frequented the temple, but the drift of the new teaching was such that Stephen was charged with speaking against the Law, and with asserting that Jesus would change the customs of Moses. We can trace the exact process when Peter was convinced that he was to do something that he and his hearers knew was against the Law, when he was called to account, when he vindicated his action (Ac 10^{29} $11^{2.17.18}$). He was presently persuaded that this was no isolated case, but a precedent (Gal 2^{11-14}). The next step was taken when an attempt was made to impose the Law upon Gentile converts, and the attempt was decisively defeated (Ac 15). The debate shows that few had grasped as yet that the Law was obsolete even for Jews, but it shows Peter taking up a position more advanced than before, declaring it an unbearable yoke.

Opinion ripened when troubles arose in other

Gentile churches; Paul argued out what he had summarily announced (Ac 13^{39}), that no one could achieve salvation by keeping the Law. As he unfolded his argument to the Romans, he arrived at the conclusion, not only that the Law was useless as a means of salvation, but that Christians are dead to the Law, discharged from it (Ro $7^{4.6}$). He was careful to say that the Law was good; he went as far as to say that he was establishing it rather than voiding it; but the course of the argument shows that he was establishing it on a very new footing. Its value henceforth consisted, as it had been with the Psalmist, in convincing a man of his sin and impotence (Ro $7^{7.21}$); and in driving him in despair to Christ for salvation (Ro 7^{24-25}, Gal 3^{24}). As a means of salvation it is ineffective, as a Law it is not binding on a Christian (Ro $8^{3.2}$). Christ is the end of the Law (Ro 10^{4}); He is the climax to whom it was leading up; He brings it to an end.

Paul developed this doctrine at much length, and in his later writings it appears incidentally, as axiomatic. What divided Jew from Gentile? the Law: Christ's work was to reconcile Jew and Gentile, therefore He broke down the wall, abolishing the Law (Eph 2^{15}). The bond written in ordinances, He has taken out of the way and nailed it to the cross (Col 2^{14}). The Law was made for sinners, and is good for them; but it is not meant for a man justified by Christ (1 Ti $1^{8.9}$).

Cognate doctrine was taught in other quarters. James contented himself with the negative side and did not explicitly unfold the positive. When he expounded what is pure religion, he did not mention the Law; rather he referred to the perfect law of liberty, the royal law: and this, though he expressed it in a sentence from the Law, is not that Mosaic Law. Concerning that, he said briefly that a breach of it in any one point is as bad as a general disregard—whence it follows that it may as well be neglected altogether. He reasserted that the law by which we shall be judged, is a law of liberty (2^{8-12}). Yet he forbade to speak evil of the Law (4^{11}); the point is that while it is good, it is no longer put forward as binding. Meanwhile, as regards Gentiles, James had taken the lead in dictating the letter which expressly exonerated them from any obligation to it.

Many Hebrews were reluctant to abandon their venerable code, and it became necessary to reiterate that the Law was expired. Paul had dropped the hint that it was only parenthetical, till Christ (Gal $3^{17.19}$). This was now developed on a new side, illustrations being taken from the ritual side rather than the ethical. The argument ran substantially thus: The Law confined the priesthood to the sons of Aaron, yet a psalmist contemplated another priesthood on the lines of Melchizedek; this involved a change of the Law (He 7^{12}). The priesthood made nothing perfect; this fact revealed that the Law made nothing perfect, that it was weak and unprofitable; the Psalmist foresaw a time when it would be annulled, indeed, the oath he records virtually annulled it at once; ($7^{18.19.28}$). Jeremiah saw that the first Covenant, which was the foundation of the whole Law, was faulty, and he predicted a new one; that prediction deprived the Law of its title to respect, showing it to be obsolescent (8). As for the details of ritual in the Law, meats and drinks and ablutions, with the gifts and sacrifices, they were mere temporary ordinances, quite useless to satisfy the conscience ($9^{9.10}$). Ceaseless shedding of blood, and occasional sprinkling of ashes, might suit a material tabernacle; but such things were only shadows of realities, and needed to be reiterated because they effected nothing except keeping the conscience in a turmoil at their obvious insufficiency. Another voice repudiated the whole system, and offered in its place the doing of God's will. This is the essence of Christ's work, taking away the mere Law of Moses, to establish Inward Obedience ($10^{1-18.28}$). To shrink back from this to the shelter of the Law, is to displease God, as the prophet saw; it is really to court perdition ($10^{38.39}$).

This pronouncement was unmistakable. Henceforth no one could fancy that any Christian was bound to keep the Law; ethically it was behind the times, ritually it was external and slightly absurd.

In the writings of John, the Law is mentioned by him just once, as a foil: 'What did Moses give? The Law! What did Jesus Christ bring? Grace and truth.' His Epistles ignore it entirely, and emphasize as the all-sufficient rule of conduct the one sentence singled out by the Lord, which had won previous endorsement: 'Love one another.'

This review of apostolic teaching as to the Law illustrates the meaning attached here to our Lord's words. He came to 'fulfil' it. Fulfilling is not expanding it into a thing of beauty, bringing it to

fulness and completion, so as to inaugurate a new era of usefulness for it. No apostle takes that view of it. Fulfilling is, primarily, obeying it, and secondarily, bringing it to an end. Its chief value had been to educate a longing for a Saviour, while incidentally it had reflected something of Christ before His coming, as the Alpine peak catches the rays before the sun shines into the valleys. Now that the Saviour is come, and we dwell in the light of the sun of righteousness, what need of any childish toying with a mirror?

4. Two Applications of the Doctrine.

The early Church grasped this fully. While appeal was made to the O.T. in many ways, so that this assumed a position for all Christians quite unlike any other literature, there was deliberate and repeated repudiation of the Law as binding. Ignatius warned two churches against Judaizing; Justin discussed the matter with Trypho at some length; Aristides and others were at pains to dissociate Christians from Jews in the eyes of the world at large. But as the Jewish Christians were outnumbered by Gentile, were isolated and forgotten, other currents began to run. The positions of 'Barnabas' and Marcion provoked a reaction, the antithesis was no longer so clear, and within three centuries a new legalism arose. It is needless to mention all the errors which from time to time have been buttressed by false ideas as to the Law; but there are two modern misconceptions which deserve to be pointed out, that it may be seen how untenable they are when the words of our Lord are rightly understood.

One is as to conduct. Modern Jews have classified their Law into various sections: Sacrificial, Ceremonial, Political, Moral. The Sacrificial and Political precepts they hold to be in abeyance because they have no temple and no national existence; the Ceremonial and the Moral they consider still obligatory. With much less logic, some Christians cast away also the Ceremonial, but look fondly on the Moral, and they especially revere the Ten Commandments.

To this course there are many objections. Those commandments are plainly prefaced: 'I Jehovah am thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt.' Jehovah did not bring us Britons out of Egypt; and this preface warns us that the commandments were for another people, as much as the Code of Hammurabi or of Confucius. Again, those commandments are part, and only part, of a far more extensive code, whose first instalment covers Ex 20–23. We have no right to take part and neglect the rest of this code; in its final form as known in our Lord's day and to us, it emphatically presents itself as one complete whole. Repeatedly we are warned against picking out portions; if we touch any, we are debtors to keep the whole Law. Still less are we at liberty to modify; the only consistent Christians here are the Seventh-day Baptists, who take the Fourth Commandment quite simply and obey it literally. Again, those commandments are seriously inadequate, and were exposed as such by our Lord. They forbid murder but not anger, adultery but not lascivious words, false evidence but not lying. In the light of His teaching we see that they are mainly negative; they offer no hint as to courtesy, humility, mercy, which are set in the forefront by Him. As a code of conduct, the Law is defective, redundant, misleading; it is far inferior to the one rule, 'Love one another.'

There is another and newer misconception. Dr. Farquhar has recently studied the relationship of Christianity to Hinduism (*I.R.M.*, July 1914), and he quotes this saying of our Lord as the key to the situation. But when he speaks of the conception of Fulfilment, he interprets it differently. 'In most cases He fulfils by universalizing a narrow precept, or moralizing an external command.' It has already been pointed out that He is not fulfilling in the cases cited (Mt 5^{21-44}), He is criticizing adversely. Much more to the point is the recognition that 'there is another group of cases in which, while the moralizing process is very prominent, there is also the dissolution of an old institution. . . . In all these cases the change is so overturning that the idea of completion scarcely seems to fit well.' It certainly does not, and we have shown that this is a different thought. Unfortunately Dr. Farquhar reads back this thought into the word Fulfil, and then, with the wrong idea that Christ made the Law blossom out into Christianity, he draws his inferences.

He turns to India, and argues that Christ can make Hinduism also blossom out into Christianity. In this reasoning there are two fallacies. Our Lord was speaking of the Jewish Law, not of Hinduism at all: what He could do for the one, He never promised for the other; the one was God's careful preparation in one chosen nation until the fulness

of time came, and there is nothing beyond a general statement that God has not left Himself without witness in any nation, to encourage the thought that a similar preparation has been made in other great religious systems. The second fallacy is that with which this paper is concerned. He did not say of the Law that He came to make it bloom out into perfection, but that He came to obey it. Whether or no He meant that He came to end it, He really did so, and the apostles taught that explicitly.

Dr. Farquhar's practical proposals have no scriptural support here, and his projects show the dangers that arise when we forget the elementary process of examining what a word means.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford.

The Hittites.[1]

The Hittites have fallen into good hands. They have now found a historian in the most distinguished historical scholar of Germany, Professor Eduard Meyer, who has just published an account of them and their monuments, which is at once clear, compact, and thorough. It falls into two parts, the first of these being intended for the general public, while the second part contains an exhaustive list of references together with a mass of scientific details, all brought up to date. There are numerous illustrations, moreover, which have been selected with remarkable skill.

That the work should have been entrusted to Professor Eduard Meyer is peculiarly appropriate. It was an article of his that first drew my attention to the Hittite monuments years ago, and it was he who first welcomed and accepted my discovery of the Hittite empire. To those who remember the controversies of the early eighties, the universal acceptance to-day of the views which I then propounded will seem somewhat astonishing.

But before going further I have to make a confession. While the learned world has come over to my historical theories and combinations, I have myself been forced by the decipherment of the inscriptions to modify them in one important point. Professor Meyer's book represents my historical belief up to two or three years ago; I have now been compelled to change it. Instead of one Hittite empire, with its capital at Boghaz-Keui, north of the Halys, there were two empires, the second of which rose on the ruins of the first. This second empire was the Cilician empire of Solinus, which was founded by the Moschians—not by the Hittites proper—about B.C. 1200, and had its main centre at Tyana. It is to this second empire that the hieroglyphic inscriptions belong which testify to its spread from Lydia in the west to Carchemish in the east, and in which Sandes or Sandakos appears as the national god in place of Tesub. Most of the monuments, accordingly, which we have regarded as evidence of the existence of the earlier empire really bear witness, not to the Hittites of Boghaz-Keui, but to the Moschian Hittites of Tyana. Indeed, it is probable that the same Moschians formed part of the host of northern barbarians, as the Egyptians called them, who destroyed the earlier Hittite empire and swept over the civilized world as far as the borders of Egypt. Chushan-rish-athaim of Naharaim would have been one of their kings.

I can, therefore, no longer regard many of the monuments figured in Professor Meyer's book, as well as in other works on the Hittites, including my own, as connected with the empire whose history is now being recovered from the cuneiform tablets of Boghaz-Keui. It is true that the Moschians belonged to the same racial stock as the Hittites of Boghaz-Keui, and the name Hittite occasionally appears in their inscriptions, but their language was not the same as that of Boghaz-Keui and they called themselves Moschians and Cilicians rather than Hittites. Nor were they governed by an autocratic monarchy like the Hittites of the first empire; their government was theocratic, and the numerous kinglets were under the control of a high priest. The Hittite hieroglyphics, however, were used at Boghaz-Keui contemporaneously with the cuneiform characters, but whether the

[1] *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter.* By Eduard Meyer. Berlin, 1914.

phonetic values attached to them were the same as those which they had in the later texts is questionable.

It must be borne in mind, therefore, that in Professor Meyer's book, as in all previous works upon the Hittites, two entirely different periods of 'Hittite' history have been combined together, which it will be the business of future research to separate and disentangle. We shall probably discover that what is true of the one is not necessarily true of the other.

It is needless to say that the whole body of material at present known to us has been treated by Professor Meyer with masterly skill. Lucid arrangement, historical insight, and sound judgment are well-known characteristics of the author, and his book, as might be expected, is not a compilation merely, but contains new facts and fresh points of view. Some of the illustrations appear in it for the first time.

The seal with cuneiform characters given on page 44 seems to be an attempt to represent a real inscription and not an example of the use of cuneiform characters for ornamental purposes only. The inner circle of characters would read *us-ti*(?)-*ku*(?)-*wa-as*, while the outer circle is *si-i-e*(?)-*khu-uz-zi-ya us-te- . . . -ka*(?)-*ar*. The statement that men and deities are not represented with a beard on the monuments of Carchemish must be corrected in the light of the recent excavations there. The identification, moreover, of Katpatuka with Kizzuwadana (as the name is written in the cuneiform tablets of Boghaz-Keui) is not due to Dr. Herzfeld, as Professor Meyer believes, but to Professor Hommel, who suggested it several years ago. In Hittite history Cappadocia took the place of Arzawa—which, by the way, is mentioned in the Golénischeff Geographical Papyrus—just as Quê took the place of Alashiya in Eastern Cilicia during the Moschian age. But these are minute details, interesting only to the "Hittitologist"!

The first part of the report on the excavations at Carchemish conducted by the British Museum has just been issued in a princely volume entitled *Carchemish* (British Museum, 1914). It contains a short Preface by Sir F. C. Kenyon, and an exhaustive and very instructive introduction by Mr. Hogarth on Djerabis or Jerablus, the modern site of Carchemish. This is followed by a series of plates with photographs of the inscriptions and sculptures discovered by the excavators, Messrs. Woolley and Lawrence. The plates leave nothing to be desired, and the completeness and artistic finish of the inscriptions make them the most valuable Hittite hieroglyphic texts that have yet been found. They materially lighten the task of the decipherer, whose thanks are due to the authorities of the British Museum for their early publication.

Some of the oldest texts belong to Katuas, who may be the Katê of the Assyrian inscriptions, who was king of Quê in B.C. 850. One of the chapels was built by Kanas, high priest of Quê, to whom the long inscription now in the British Museum also belongs. The finest of the inscriptions, however, is that of Imeis (or Yamois), who was viceroy of the great king of Tyana.

The sculptures throw a welcome light on later Hittite art. The archæological results of the excavations, however, are not touched upon in the present volume; for these we must go to the articles contributed to the *Times* and other papers by Messrs. Hogarth and Woolley.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XVII. 32.

Remember Lot's Wife.

1. LOT'S wife appears but a moment on the page of history. She is like a spectre, rising from the earth, moving slowly across our field of vision, and then disappearing. Hence her history is all centred in a single point, and that the last. It has no beginning and no middle, but an end—a fearful end. Its course is like that of the black and silent train, to which the match is at last applied, and it ends in a flash and an explosion. Our first view of Lot's wife is afforded by the light of the sulphurous flames already bursting from the battlements

and housetops of the reprobate city; our last view, the moment after, by the same fires as they mount to heaven and light up the whole horizon, revealing, among many old, familiar objects, one never seen before—a pillar of salt upon the road to Zoar. That very pillar was the thing which the disciples called to mind when Jesus said, 'Remember Lot's wife.'

2. Our Lord is speaking of His advent to judge the world, whether that advent takes place when a great city, a great empire, a great economy, passes away in blood and fire and smoke, or in those crowded moments of our individual lives in which we have to make an instant and pregnant decision between the warring affections and desires of the soul that will give a bias to our whole after life. At such moments Christ 'comes' to us, comes to force us to decision, to compel us to choose between the higher and the lower aims of human life, and to show what manner of spirit we are of. He descends—so the context implies—with all His train, and flashes by us with lightning speed. If we so love Him, and all that He stands for and represents to us, that at once, without any hesitation or delay, we choose the better part and join His train, we not only escape condemnation; we save, we quicken, our life into life eternal. But if, as in the days of Noah, and again in the days of Lot, we are so busy eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building, marrying and giving in marriage, so preoccupied with the cravings and affairs of this present world, or so drowned in self-indulgence and sensuous desires, that 'the things of the spirit' have little charm and value for us, and we let the critical, auspicious moment pass; if, as the heavenly pageant flashes by, we do not lift up our heads and cry, 'Thine are we, O Christ, and on Thy side, Thou Son of Man,' we miss our happy chance, and lose our life instead of saving it.

Worldliness and carnal-mindedness are incompatible with vivid realization of the presence, grace, and loving-kindness of Christ whether directly manifested or more indirectly. It is strange and fearful how the worldly and carnal spirit at once darkens the vision and deadens the spiritual senses, and by degrees reveals its inmost essence as 'enmity to God.' 'The carnal mind is enmity to God'—nothing truer! And it is terrible how hard it is to overcome the world and the flesh, especially when aided by the devil. It is like walking up a hill when there is a thaw after frost—one toils and toils, and yet keeps slipping back almost as far as one advances.[1]

[1] D. W. Simon in *Life*, by F. J. Powicke, 314.

I.

The Spell of Sodom.

1. We read that Lot 'pitched his tent toward Sodom.' There is quite a dramatic touch there. Not in the city, or even near to it, but in the direction of it. He was not prepared to throw in his lot with the men of that city yet. A man cannot go direct from the company of saintly Abraham to a bacchanalian crew like that which held its revels there. He slides down to them by an easy, gradual descent. A man clings hard to the remnant of his religion, even when he has allowed the greater part of it to go. He fights for the shell and form of it more than he did for the life and substance. Lot pitched his tent toward Sodom, no doubt making virtuous resolutions that he would never go down to live there. He would only trade with these people, and visit them occasionally, and still hold himself in the main aloof. Alas for these resolutions of men whose hearts are on the down grade! Lot did not long remain in the remote outskirts of the city. The huge whirlpool swiftly drew him in. Presently we find him living at the very gates at Sodom—marvellously advanced in position, a man of great consequence, with his daughters married to notable citizens, and sunk down to the level of those citizens, so depraved that their after-story is not fit for decent lips; and his whole household has breathed the pestilent moral air of the place, and become diseased. A miserable outcome, surely, of a life that began in a noble journey of faith. With all his getting and gains and advancements he has but a poor show to make of it in the end.

2. Perhaps Lot's wife was a native of Sodom. In the earlier chapters of Abraham's story, Lot is constantly mentioned, and 'his goods,' but there is never any mention of a wife. In the recital of Lot's rescue after the Battle of the Five Kings, it is said that Abraham 'brought again his brother Lot, and his goods, and the women also, and the people.' The phraseology is too vague to make one sure that even here a wife of Lot is included, though it seems probable. May we not infer from her late appearance, that she was a daughter of the land, a native of the city 'toward' which Lot pitched his tent (Gn 13^{12})?

She followed 'behind him.' 'That is no true sacrifice,' it has been said, 'which is regretted.' Therefore Lot's wife never left Sodom. Her feet

took her out of the city; but she was of it all the time. If Calais was written on the heart of an English queen, Sodom was written on hers. Her husband, once started, would quicken his step perhaps: but his lingering had helped to make her steps leaden.

The tone of the narrative justifies us in concluding that, although Lot's own spirituality was ebbing away, Lot's wife sadly lagged behind her husband spiritually; he was tempted more and more to take her pace, his foot having already halted when he began to grow unfaithful to the gleam of God. This is the world's recurring tragedy—when a good man fails, because of some fault in his goodness, to redeem a dull-souled wife; or a good woman, like Abigail, to redeem her dull-souled husband. In Lot's household there is little trace of his piety: there are traces enough of a sinister influence in the callousness of his sons-in-law's families; to them 'he seemed as one that mocked.'

3. It may be that Lot's wife helped him to go down the steep descent; that she held him back—by sheer weight of indifference, or worse—from reclimbing the steep ascent. He would be free, with one firm stroke; but the chain of circumstance and of habit was too cunningly welded by the length of years, too insinuatingly a part of his very life. The newly awakened decision was goaded and yet weakened by the newly awakened anxiety:

> I, in mine own love's strength seem to decay,
> O'ercharged with burthen of mine own love's might.

Given such a companionship, of a disfigured spiritual nature allied with an earthen nature never loftily moved, the moment of the former's awakening must always be as a breath of hell, because of the sense of the ineffectiveness of all struggle. The awakened soul appeals, but the other does not respond—has no response to give. It is as if a lark, suddenly feeling the joy of wings, would have the clod where its nest and nursing-place had been rise with it to sunny altitudes of the morning. The clod is clod still, though for weeks it has felt the warmth of so tuneful a breast. Lot grew disturbed, felt the power of earlier, finer feelings, became anxious not only for himself but for others: but how could the wife at his side, with no such early raptures to aid her, rise to his sudden earnestness? It is something to the credit of his influence, perhaps, that she was willing to leave Sodom at all. But even to the last his helpfulness was imperfect. 'He lingered.' There were links of the chain not yet snapped. She must have noticed it; and it helped to quench the 'smoking flax' of her faith—or her fear.

We are to will our salvation in such sort as God wills it; now He wills it by way of desire, and we also must incessantly desire it, in conformity with His desire. Nor does He will it only, but, in effect, gives us all necessary means to attain to it. We then, in fulfilment of the desire we have to be saved, must not only wish to be saved, but, in effect, must accept all the graces which He has provided for us, and offers us. With regard to salvation itself, it is enough to say: I desire to be saved. But, with regard to the means of salvation, it is not enough to say: I desire them. We must, with an absolute resolution, will and embrace the graces which God presents to us; for our will must correspond with God's will. And, inasmuch as He gives us the means of salvation, we ought to avail ourselves of such means, just as we ought to desire salvation in such sort as God desires it for us, and because He desires it.[1]

II.

The Pull of the Higher Life.

1. Lot's wife, like the rest, heard the summons to escape from Sodom. God saves all He can. The door of mercy is opened to others as well as to Lot. His wife's deliverance had been cared for too, and measures taken to secure her with the rest. One of the angels clasped her hand and drew her out of the conflagration by main force. Almost against her will she was hurried so far out of danger, and the mountain-road, with its hastening fugitives, stretched out clear before her, when, in that one glance behind, her incurably corrupt nature came out, and the stroke fell.

2. The angels took them by the hand. Here is Divine importunity. The angels use gentle constraint towards Lot and his household. The narrative not only shows that the God of righteous judgment is also a God of mercy, but it emphasizes the great truth that the Divine mercy is intense and active, pressing itself even upon those who are reluctant to receive its benefits. God is more eager to deliver than to condemn all who can be brought within the range of His compassions. The Lord's messengers would not have saved Lot and his family out of Sodom unless in their urgency they had taken the group of hesitating worldlings by the hand and overborne their double-mindedness. The utmost

[1] St. Francis De Sales, *The Love of God*, viii. 4.

wisdom and persuasion bade fair to prove unavailing without this added mark of zeal. And if angels could do their work only at a white heat of fervour we shall not attain success in attempts made at any lower temperature.

I have known young men saved by the voice of a kindly bystander who, seeing the struggle in their face, has said, 'I would not do it, if I were you, sir,' or by a sudden recollection of a pure and loving home, and of the grief and shame with which it would be darkened were it ever known that they had yielded to a temptation so base. And how could they help being saved if they remembered that the kindest Heart in the universe would be pained by their fall? —if they could hear the tender voice of the Son of Man, saying, 'Son, remember.'[1]

Complain not that the way is long—what road is weary that leads there?
But let the Angel take thy hand, and lead thee up the misty stair,
And then with beating heart await the opening of the Golden Gate.[2]

III.

Fatal Hesitation.

1. Lot's wife lingered on her way, and hastened not to escape for her life; she tempted God by her disobedience, and that disobedience, that forbidden delay, was her ruin. She was turned into a pillar of salt, which is supposed to mean that she was caught by the burning flames, which had by this time extended far across the plain; she was caught by them and encrusted, as it were, by the particles of sulphur which they contained; and so, instead of crumbling to ashes, she remained after death a standing monument of the Almighty's wrath, which is revealed from heaven against all the children of disobedience.

It is one act, one look only, and one lingering step, that has thus passed irrevocably into the rock for ever associated with the name of Lot's wife; but just as, with the saint or martyr in one great and good act of faith, there is much going before, preparing for that trial of a moment, so must it have been with her. How much may be contained in one hesitating step, and one sigh of regret! An act, a word, a look—even a thought or resolution which has had no opportunity of showing itself in act, word, or glance—has decided for ever the lot of the human soul. Was it not by one short transgression of Eve that all was lost? But why is it thus? Because, though such may stand singly in the life of any one as it comes out to man, yet in the secret history of the soul, as seen by the eye of God, such cannot stand alone; much must have been going on before the will has taken its decided bent for good or evil.

2. 'She looked back.' The words used in Genesis when we are told that she 'looked back' on the burning city is a much stronger word than that used two verses lower down, where we are told that Abraham 'looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah.' Abraham's look was only a rapid and terrified glance; but the look of Lot's wife was a look 'of deliberate contemplation, of steadfast regard, of strong desire.' She looked back wistfully, longingly, as one whose treasure was in the city, and whose heart was there also. She would fain have gone after her heart had she dared. She would rather have stayed amid all the sins of Sodom, if she might have carried on her old easy life in it, than have climbed the mountain, to commence a new life and to dwell apart with God. Her look was an unspoken prayer; and her prayer was answered: she knew 'the misery of a granted prayer.' She lingered behind as one who would fain stay behind; and she did stay, though only as a heap of salt, and of salt that had lost its savour.

It is dangerous in religion to fall forward by overmuch zeal, yet not so dangerous as to fall backward by an unfaithful heart. The former may injure his face and lose his comfort, but the latter is in danger utterly to break the neck of his conscience, as old Eli by falling backward brake his neck bodily and died.[3]

3. She became a pillar of salt. Smothered with the sulphurous smoke of the volcanic flames, just as the elder Pliny was suffocated with the fumes of sulphur and bitumen at the destruction of Pompeii, she fell into a heap, and was gradually encrusted with the saline particles of which the air in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea is still full. Such heaps, or lumps, formed from spray, mist, and saline exhalations which have gathered round a core of fallen trees or beasts are still common on the shores of that Sea of Salt, and always have been common. Josephus identified one of them with Lot's wife more than eighteen centuries ago, as the Arabs do to this day.[4]

It is peculiarly interesting to contrast the story of Medusa with its Hebrew parallel in Lot's wife. Both are women

[1] S. Cox, *Expositions*, iv. 290.
[2] A. Procter, *Legends and Lyrics*, i. 183.
[3] John Robinson, in *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England*, by John Brown, D.D., 134.
[4] S. Cox.

presumably beautiful, and both are turned to stone. But while the Greek petrifaction is the result of too direct a gaze upon the horrible, the Hebrew is the result of too loving and desirous a gaze upon the coveted beauty of the world. Nothing could more exactly represent and epitomize the diverse genius of the nations.

To the Greek, ugliness was dangerous, and the horror of the world having no explanation nor redress, could but petrify the heart of man. To the Hebrew the beauty of the world was dangerous, and man must learn to turn away his eyes from beholding vanity.[1]

(1) The pillar of salt may be regarded as *a symbol of character*.—Lot's wife is not a pillar of salt in an Eastern land, but the expression of a life over which surges of its own past have gone till repeated acts of indulgence have formed into habit and fixed the character. The single acts seem so insignificant in themselves—the missing of opportunity, the clinging to little luxuries and indulgences. But the will is enfeebled, the signs of inevitable retribution are unnoted, and the judgment comes as a thief in the night.

In almost every case where they have found the remains of bodies among the ashes at Pompeii, they had some little bunch of keys or bag of treasure with them—evidently something which had kept them the few minutes too long. One I shall never forget. It is a woman's figure, lying as she fell, with the arm and the folds of her dress gathered before her face just as she tried to keep off the dreadful choking ashes, but all in vain. There she fell as she was running in the street; and the ashes buried her, and hardened into stone; and the body gradually decayed away, and 1700 years after, digging there, they found the hollow where it had been, like a great mould, and poured in plaster, and got the very cast of it, so that you can see the very expression of her face, and the folds of her dress, and can count the very threads of it. And see: in the skeleton fingers of one hand was found a little bag—just a few rings and brooches. She had only stopped for those. It would not take a minute. They were all on her dressing-table. Cannot you think how she would call out to her husband to go on with the children and she would be after him before he got to the city gate! But ah! when they got where they could look back safely, there was no mother, and no word of her, and never any word for all these centuries until the workman's pick came on that hollow in the lava. And now you see her with the little jewel-bag in her hand, for all the world like that old story of Lot's wife done into sad and startling fact.[2]

(2) The pillar of salt may also be regarded as *a monument of destiny*—a witness of righteous judgment. We are told to remember her; and when we recall her to our minds there is absolutely nothing to remember about her except the solitary fact that on the way from Sodom she looked back from behind her husband, and became a pillar of salt. That is all; but that is enough for our Lord. It suits Him the better because it is so simple. The great issues of life are extremely simple. Religion may be elaborated and refined to any extent. And when it is, there is always a danger of our losing sight of the simplicity of its great issues. You have got to remember Lot's wife, our Lord means to say, because her temptation, her danger, is yours; because her fate might be yours too, possibly. You, too, have to leave Sodom, the city of sin, where also your Lord was crucified. The people of the city are wicked and sinners exceedingly. You do not love the wickedness, indeed—we have no reason to suppose that Lot's wife did, nor is it likely—but the wickedness is somehow inextricably mixed up with the beauty, and riches, and ease, and luxury of the place, with its soft enervating climate, and its wealth of fruit and flowers.

It has been the ambition of some men to raise a memorial column to keep their name in remembrance, and Absalom's pillar was long all that remained to him of that earthly glory to which he aspired; but with Lot's wife it has been like a burning brand once saved, but cast again into the fire, which smoulders on, and its smoke still ascends for ever. That desolate region marks the judgment that has passed; and continues to foretell the Judgment yet to come, looking before and after. As we read in the Book of Wisdom, 'Of whose wickedness even to this day the waste land that smoketh is a testimony,' and 'a standing pillar of salt is a monument of an unbelieving soul.' Nay, it is not now a solitary pillar; for in all the pillars of salt that mark that region of death some say, 'This is the pillar of Lot's wife,' and some say, 'that'; so much does her remembrance haunt and people the plain—nay, every country under Heaven. And all this on account of the awful mention which is made of her in the Book of God; that one short verse in the Old Testament, and that one yet shorter sentence in the New.[3]

(3) The pillar of doom in Sodom's vale, by way of merciful contrast, *suggests the promise given to him who 'holds fast' what he hath*: 'Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name' (Rev 3^{12}). Yea, surely, His new name: for with-

[1] 'The Gods of Greece,' in *Among Famous Books*, by Dr. John Kelman, 26.

[2] B. Herford, *Courage and Cheer*, 81.

[3] I. Williams, *Female Characters of Holy Scripture*, 23.

out Him, and all the grace that is in Him, who could hope to become a fit pillar of that Temple? He helps us, not only to leave Sodom, but to be rid of the Sodom in our heart.

When wickedness is broken as a tree,
Paradise comes to light, ah, holy land!
Whence death has vanished like a shifting sand,
And barrenness is banished with the sea.
Its bulwarks are salvation fully manned,
All gems it hath for glad variety,
And pearls for pureness radiant glimmeringly,
And gold for grandeur where all good is grand.
An inner ring of saints meets linked above,
And linked of angels is an outer ring;
For voice of waters or for thunders' voice
Lo! harps and songs wherewith all saints rejoice,
And all the trembling there of any string
Is but a trembling of enraptured love.[1]

[1] Christina G. Rossetti, *Verses*, 152.

LITERATURE.

Aked (C. F.), *Old Events and Modern Meanings*, 27.
Alexander (J. A.), *The Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 88.
Cox (S.), *Expositions*, iv. 280.
Herford (B.), *Courage and Cheer*, 79.
Lewis (H. E.), in *Women of the Bible*, 25.
Mackay (W. M.), *Bible Types of Modern Women*, 213.
Mackintosh (H. R.), *Life on God's Plan*, 115.
Paget (F. E.), *Helps and Hindrances to the Christian Life*, ii. 62.
Price (A. C.), *Fifty Sermons*, x. 185.
Rawnsley (R. D. B.), *Village Sermons*, i. 215.
Temple (F.), *Rugby Sermons*, ii. 312.
Virgin (S. H.), *Spiritual Sanity*, 140.
Williams (I.), *Female Characters of Holy Scripture*, 23.
Winterbotham (R.), *Sermons*, 132.
Christian World Pulpit, ix. 344 (T. R. Stevenson).
Churchman's Pulpit: First Sunday in Lent, v. 344 (A. M. Mackay); The Old and New Year, ii. 380 (T. C. Williams).

Arabic Christian Literature.

BY MARGARET D. GIBSON, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., CAMBRIDGE.

I.

CHRISTIANITY must have been introduced amongst the Arabs at a very early period, possibly by one of our Lord's Apostles themselves. Wellhausen points out that *nasrānī*, the Arabic word for *Christian*, used chiefly in the Corân, must have been adopted before the Syriac word *mesheeḥaya* came into use; so that for philological reasons we are not justified in supposing that Arabia first received the gospel from Syria. Yet, once a spark was kindled, the neighbourhood of Christian Syrians on the N., and of Ethiopians and Abyssinians on the S.W., would help to fan the flame, and before the time of the Hegira the Peninsula was interpenetrated by Christianity. The great tribes of the Qudaâ adopted it, and Nöldeke suggests that *Couri*, the battle-cry of the Gudhana, is in reality the Greek κύριε. Even to-day, the Bedaween of the Sinai Peninsula betray their Christian ancestry by making the sign of the cross over graves, and around their sleeping-places, to ward off demons. We may conjecture, from the child-like nature of the sons of the desert, that in many quarters outward symbols would be adopted, without any intelligent understanding of their meaning, and that a long inheritance of heathen ideas and customs would predispose the Christian communities to heresies.

We shall begin our survey of Christian Arabic literature by mentioning what we possess in the way of translations of the Holy Scriptures. The Bible was doubtless early translated into Arabic, for the poet Al Birāk (A.D. 470–525) is said to have been taught to read it by a monk. Abu 'l Faraj (Ibn et Taib) speaks of an Arabic translation of the Bible, and says that the Patriarch Hanna (631–649) was told by the Emir Amr b. Sadb to translate the Gospels from Syriac into Arabic, leaving out the name of Jesus, and all mention of Baptism and the Cross; but on the Patriarch replying that he would rather die than leave out one jot or one tittle, the general gave way. In the Archiepiscopal Library at Diarbekr there are eleven MSS. of the Gospels, translated from the Peshiṭta; besides several commentaries, martyrologies, and sermons by Ephraim, Chrysostom, etc. We give a list of the principal Arabic Scriptures known in European libraries for which we are chiefly indebted to the work of Graf:—

1. Ps 77, 20, 21, 31–61, in Greek and Arabic. End of eighth century. Found by Dr. Bruno Violet in the Genizeh of a mosque at Damascus.

2. Job, fragmentary. Ninth century, brought by Tischendorff to Europe. British Museum, 261.16 (Cod. or. 1473), probably from Mar Saba.

3. The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, in Cod. Sin. arab. 155.

4. Gospels, Cod. Vat. or. 13. Eighth century.

5. Gospels, Cod. K.I.I. 31. Mus. Borg. Congreg. Prop. Fid., probably from Mar Saba.

6. Cod. Tisch. xxxi. Ninth or tenth century. From Mar Saba. Two leaves, fragments. Mk 10^{19}–11^{4}. Mk 14^{13}–15^{2}.

7. Cod. Sin. Arab. 75. Tenth century. See Mrs. Lewis, *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists*, ii. 96 f. Photographs of it may be seen at Westminster College, Cambridge.

8. A similar MS. in the Library of the Holy Sepulchre Church at Jerusalem. For others see *Studia Sinaitica*, No. iii.

9. The Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles. Cod. Sin. 154. Ninth century, edited by M. D. Gibson as *Studia Sinaitica*, No. vii. It is defective at the commencement, and begins with Ac 7^{37}. Dr. Merx believes it to have been translated from the Philoxenian Syriac, which it follows closely.

10. Four of the Pauline Epistles, from Cod. Sin. 155. Ninth century, edited by M. D. Gibson as *Studia Sinaitica*, No. ii., probably translated from the Greek, and in Ryssel's opinion, corrected from the Peshitta. The last leaves are lost, and it contains Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians as far as 1^{9}.

11. Job. Cod. Tischend. Lips, made known by Gildemeister. Tenth century.

12. Fragments from the Pauline Epistles, made known by Tischendorff. A.D. 892.

13. Gospels, Beyrout, No. v. Tenth century.

14. Tatian's *Diatessaron*, as published by P. Aug. Ciasca, Rome, 1888, from two MSS., one in Mus. Borg., the other Cod. Vat. or. 14. The first is perfect. In the second, which is defective, the genealogies are interpolated by a later hand. The Jesuits in Beyrout possess some fragments of the *Diatessaron*. Although the Borgian MS. bears the name of Abu 'l Faraj (Ibn et Taib), the Beyrout one has indications of an earlier origin.

15. A translation of the Gospels in rhymed prose, of the tenth century, preserved in Cod. Vat. or. 17 and 18, in Cod. Leid. or. 2348, the last being dated A.D. 993. The proper names are given in their Moslem forms. Guidi conjectures that this is the work of some Christian philosophers, who endeavoured to recommend their religion to their Moslem friends.

16. A translation of the Gospels, contained in Brit. Mus. Cod. or. 13, of the fourteenth century; in a Cod. of the Cathedral archives in Leon; in Cod. Monac. ar. 238 (or 41); in Cod. Monac. ar. 234 (or 40); and there is a fragment in a Tischendorff MS. at Leipzig.

The second of these (Cod. ar. 238) contains also an extract from Eusebius' Church History, and was written by the Deacon Abu 'Omar at Fez. in A.D. 1394, from a copy made in 1145.

Cod. 234, A.D. 1492, contains also the Pentateuch. It is written by a Moslem. This translation was made from the Latin, in A.D. 946, by Isaac Velasquez of Cordova.

17. The whole Bible published at Mosul by Joseph David, 1865.

18. The Arabic New Testament published by the American Press at Beyrout during the last century is a masterly work, and far more scholarly than had ever been accomplished previously. It is the work of the late Dr. Van Dyck (revised by Nasīf al Yaziji).

In the monasteries of Sinai and Mar Saba a number of Christian monks translated into Arabic the writings of Greek theologians, as well as Martyrdoms and the Lives of Saints. There are in the Library at Sinai about 350 MSS. of such works, which were roughly catalogued by Mrs. Gibson before the books were put into their present good order (see *Studia Sinaitica*, No. iii., Cambridge, 1894). The Mar Saba MSS. have been brought to Jerusalem, the collection as a whole being inferior to that at Sinai. There are similar Arabic translations mouldering in the Coptic monasteries in Egypt, namely: Deyr Antonius, Deyr Anba Bolos, and the four monasteries of the Nitrian Valley. The only ones which have been published from all this mass of material are:

In *Studia Sinaitica*, No. v., edited by Margaret D. Gibson:

1. Two recensions of the Anaphora Pilati, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 508, and 445.

2. The Recognitions of Clement, in two recensions, one from Cod. Sin. Ar. No. 508, and the

other from Brit. Mus. xxviii. (Add 9965). A.D. 1569.

3. The Martyrdom of Clement, also from Brit. Mus. xxviii.

4. A story called the Preaching of Peter, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 445.

5. Martyrdom of James, son of Alphæus, Preaching of Simon, son of Cleophas, and Martyrdom of Simon, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 536.

In *Studia Sinaitica*, viii.

6. Kitāb al Majall, or the Book of the Rolls, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 508; a story which had been published by Dr. Bezold of Munich in 1888 from the Paris MS. 76, under the title of the 'Cave of Treasures,' a translation having preceded it in 1883. It is imitated from the Syriac work, falsely attributed to Ephraim.

7. The Story of Aphikia, from Paris, Ar. 50.

8. The Story of Cyprian and Justa, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 445.

9. The Mythological Acts of the Apostles, from MSS. in the Convent of Deyr-es-Suriani, Egypt, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 539, from Cod. Sin. Ar. o, and from Cod. Vat. Ar. 694. Edited by Agnes S. Lewis in *Horae Semiticae*, iii. (Cambridge, 1904).

Other translations known in Europe are, according to Graf:—

1. A collection of Lives of Saints in Cod. Tisch. ii., Leipzig, from Mar Saba, copied by a monk named Dawud, at the end of the ninth century. It contains lives of St. Euthymius (d. A.D. 473), founder of the Mar Saba Monastery, of Mar Saba (d. 532), of his pupil Abramius, and of Theodosius (d. 629), was founded Deyr Dozi between Mar Saba and Bethlehem. It is supposed to have been written by Cyril of Skythopolis.

2. Cod. Vat. Ar. 71 A.D. 885. Lives of Saints, including Euthymius and Saba, Epiphanius of Cyprus, etc. It is by the monk Isaac of Sinai, copied from Antonius Dawud of Mar Saba.

3. A Tischendorff MS. in St. Petersburg, with remains of the Nicodemus Gospel. A.D. 885, written by Anton Dawud of Mar Saba, for Isaac of Sinai. This contains more than the Greek original about the Victory of Christ over Death and the Devil. The MS. contains also an account of a dispute between the Christian community at Sebaste in Cilicia in the time of Basil the Great and their Bishop Peter on the subject of his marriage.

4. Two theological treatises in Cod. Sin. Ar. 75, one being about proofs of the Being of God from Nature, and the other Questions between Christians and Jews about the Messiah.

For others see *Studia Sinaitica*, No. iii.

As original we may consider:—

1. Five anecdotes of monks in Cod. Sin. Ar. 154 (ninth century).

2. A Treatise on the Triune Nature of God, in the same Codex. Graf thinks it is original, from its simple style, and the absence of philosophical terminology so characteristic of Greek theology. It is logical, but not polemical. It cites Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament and confirms them by quotations from the Corân. Published in *Studia Sinaitica*, No. vii.

Several Christian poets flourished in what the Arabs call 'the Days of Ignorance,' of whom probably the first in point of time (if not in merit) is *Al Barāk bin Rouhān*, of Yemen (b. A.D. 470, d. 525). As a boy he was a milker of camels and carried some of the milk to a monk, who taught him to recite the Gospels. This did not prevent his taking part in wars, first against his own tribe, the Rabeá, on account of the loss of a bride, and then with his own tribe against the *Ṭéy* and the Qudaá. By his prowess he acquired the chieftainship of the Rabeá, and delivered a number of captive women, amongst whom was Leila, the girl of whose hand he had been defrauded, and who was herself a poetess. She was afterwards carried off by a son of the king of Persia, but at the urgent request of her faithless father, the poet rescued her for the second time, and she then became his wife.

Better deserving of mention is *Imrou 'l Queys* (b. A.D. 520, d. about 565), who was the son of Hujr, king of the Beni Asad.[1] His youth must have been spent among scenes of bloodshed, as forty-eight of his uncles, some of whom were poets, were massacred in a hollow by Arab allies of the Persians. As a boy his predilection for writing verse called forth contemptuous anger from his father, who even thought at one time of putting him to death as a means of wiping out the disgrace. The irrepressible youth wrote:

> When rhymes come to plague me, I chase them away,
> As a boy drives a mettlesome steed in his play;
> When they crowd round about, I pick six in a trice,
> And among them I choose me one pearl of great price.

[1] It is not quite certain whether he was a Christian or not.

Hujr was treacherously killed by some of his own people, owing to a dispute about the collection of tribute. When the news reached the poet, then in his teens, he swore that wine and sport should be forbidden to him till he should kill 100 of the Beni Asad, and cut off their forelocks. During the following night he witnessed a thunderstorm, and wrote a poem, a verse of which may be thus paraphrased:

When the moon o'er the land sends her radiance clear,
And the lightning is flashed from the cliffs' frowning face,
A rumour incredible reaches mine ear,
And shakes the firm roots of the hills from their base;
Since the children of Asad have murdered their lord,
No gleam can I see save the point of my sword.

The poet's life henceforth was spent in going from one chief to another, seeking help for his vengeance, until both Al-Mundhir, king of 'Irāq and his suzerain of Persia, Chosroes Anoushirwan, sent troops in pursuit of him. He was encumbered in his movements by the possession of a number of ancient cuirasses, heirlooms in his family. His friends, tired no doubt of harbouring and helping him, advised him to try Cæsar, and to Byzantium he accordingly repaired. Justinian received him with honour, and assigned him troops, among whose leaders were the sons of kings; but his footsteps were dogged by a spy from the Beni Asad, who, gaining the monarch's ear, suggested to him that the Arabs are a treacherous race, and that the troops furnished to the poet might be turned against the Empire. Justinian thereupon sent to the poet the gift of a robe embroidered with gold, but plentifully saturated with poison, accompanying it with a gracious letter commanding him to put it on at once as a mark of honour. The poet obeyed, and in a few minutes dropped down dead. So say the Arab chroniclers, but Greek writers affirm that he died from smallpox on his way. It is not difficult, with modern knowledge of infection, to suppose that both are correct, and that Justinian's crime was only the crime of ignorance. The Arabs place Imrou 'l Queys in the very first rank of their poets for refinement of language and eloquence of style. Muhammad said that he would be 'the leader of the poets to Hell.' He furnished models of composition to his successors, even up to the present day. One of his poems is included in the seven Mo'allakāt, said to have been hung up in the Ka'ba at Mecca.

Literature.

THE MAN OF GENIUS.

Dr. Hermann Türck's lectures on *The Man of Genius* captivated their German hearers, and when published the volume containing them ran through seven editions from 1896 to 1910. The English translation (A. & C. Black; 12s. 6d. net) was made by the late Professor G. J. Tamson, lecturer in English at Göttingen, from the sixth edition. The additions made by Dr. Türck to the seventh edition were translated by Mrs. Elizabeth C. Deibel. And the whole translation has been revised by Mr. George F. Payn, and other three scholars.

Dr. Türck has a theory. Its simplicity is its originality, and gave it its popularity. *Genius is love.* The more love the more genius, the more selfishness the less genius. For self-seeking makes one blind. The self-seeking man is the narrow-minded man. But love makes a man clairvoyant, intuitive, a diviner of hidden things.

But genius is not simply seeing, it is seeing things in harmony. And so love is always there first. 'We do not love an object because it is beautiful; it appears to us beautiful because we love it. For when we love it, we wish it to exist, and hence we shall notice in its outward appearance that, above all, which contributes to its power of existence and on which its existence depends, that is, the harmony, the vital co-operation of its parts. But again, on this harmony of the parts and their co-operation to produce a living whole all beauty depends, or rather beauty is this harmony itself, this unity in multiplicity, this order in diversity.'

Now this wonderful thing called love or sympathy expresses itself in all the experiences of life. Accordingly 'genius can be displayed in three direc-

tions, corresponding to the threefold attitude of man towards the outer world surrounding him. For firstly, man receives the impressions of the outer world; he perceives. Secondly, he mentally converts these impressions into ideas which he fits into the picture he has conceived of the world; he thinks. And thirdly, as a result of the impressions received and of the ideas he has obtained from them, he forms his resolutions and carries them out; he acts. Genius, objectivity, or disinterestedness in perception leads to the conception of the beautiful. Genius in thought leads to truth, and genius in action leads to the accomplishment of what is good, great, and of solid worth.'

Then Dr. Türck proceeds to apply this theory to the great works of genius and the men of genius, and shows how it explains them. His lectures deal with Hamlet, Faust, Manfred, Schopenhauer and Spinoza, Christ and Buddha, Alexander and Cæsar and Napoleon, Darwin and Lombroso, Stirner and Nietzsche and Ibsen, the myths of Pandora and of the Fall of Man.

Take one example: 'We now proceed to a consideration of the third way in which genius reveals itself in Hamlet's nature, namely, to a consideration of his objective, disinterested conduct. Up to recent times it has been a constant puzzle why Hamlet, after discovering the crime committed on his father, does not call the crowned murderer to account, or rather, why he does not immediately take revenge upon him, plunge the dagger into his heart, and have himself proclaimed king. I believe it is Hamlet's objectivity and extraordinary disinterestedness, his deep-seated conviction of the imperfection and sinfulness of all men, that leaves him free from the selfish impulse to seek personal satisfaction in the immediate execution of his revenge.'

THE BONDS OF SOCIETY.

Mr. John Sutherland believes that the only encouragement we have to do right is the claim that our neighbour has upon us. We are born 'in cohesion.' And we must maintain it. That is his ethics. That is also his religion. His book on *The Bonds of Society* (Heath, Cranton, & Ouseley; 10s. 6d. net) works its way through all our beliefs, and in the interests of this belief and with the aid of that new broom called 'modern thought' sweeps them out of its path.

In some ways Mr. Sutherland reminds us of Romanes—Romanes in his second and unbelieving stage. The following regret for the disappearance of belief in the efficacy of prayer is not so touching as the famous passage which Romanes wrote, but it is evidently sincere: 'If it is ordained that, in the course of knowledge we must lose our ancient faith in prayer, there is surely no man so callous and so hardened as to leave, without regret, the ancient home of our youth which is a mansion so stored with treasures—priceless treasures of poetic feeling and elevated thoughts, accumulated through the centuries, and prized more dearly by all that are worthy of their heritage than ever the material possessions gathered in a life-time were prized by one that lost his home and wandered, ruined and forlorn, upon the face of an inhospitable earth—that we lose ourselves in admiration whichever way we turn! All this we part from, and the aching pain at our hearts would crush the life out of us but that the long years of agony have raised up two champions in Fortitude and Hope, ever ready to support our flagging spirits amid even this the fiercest onslaught of doubt.'

Will Mr. Sutherland allow us to hope that a little more experience of life and a little more thought will bring him back his belief in the reality of prayer? It would be a joy to us as well as to him to find it so.

SOCIOLOGY.

The papers and addresses which Mr. Victor Branford has collected into the volume entitled *Interpretations and Forecasts* (Duckworth; 7s. 6d. net) were delivered or contributed at various times and under various circumstances. This gives the book an appearance of inconsequence and even of disorder. But that impression does not survive the reading of it. Beneath all the outward occasion lies the author's full knowledge of Sociology and strong faith in its future. His title is certainly apt enough; but his sub-title, 'A Study of Survivals and Tendencies in Contemporary Society,' is apt also, for it puts quite fairly the fact that all the papers dealing with the history of Sociological experiment in the past have this end in view, to show how the mistakes already made were made and may be avoided, and how surely Sociology, new as it seems to be, is really as old as civilization, and to be rightly understood and sent on its

beneficent way, must not be separated from its past.

Still, the great object which Mr. Branford has in view is to describe recent work in Sociology and forecast its future. Two new studies, he says, have been established—Eugenics and Civics. With their advent, there appears on the horizon a re-orientation, not only of sociology, that is, the economic and ethical sciences, but also of biology and psychology, the life and mind sciences, and even of physics and æsthetics, the use and beauty sciences. By adopting Eugenics and Civics into his scheme of studies, the sociologist has, more than before, a concrete basis and a definite objective as well as an orderly method, on which to invite—one may even say, demand—the full contributory co-operation of the cultivators of the preliminary sciences, biological and physical, who have hitherto, as a body, held coldly aloof from him. With this gospel of a Good Race and this vision of the City Beautiful, science may at length claim to complete its circle.

MARY AIKENHEAD.

Out of a vast correspondence there has been selected enough *Letters of Mary Aikenhead* to fill a volume of nearly six hundred octavo pages (Gill; 10s. 6d. net). They are true letters. That is the first thing to say about them. For their writer had no thought ever that even one of them would be printed and published. That we are told in the introduction: we can read it in every one of the letters. They are not public documents; they are private and confidential exceedingly. Yet never for a moment do they say things which could not have been spoken aloud; there is not a thought in them, or the least hint of a thought, that could not stand being proclaimed upon the housetops. As the editor truly says, 'They are the outpourings of the mind and heart of a great woman of God to those whom she felt and knew would not abuse her confidence.'

Why, then, are they published? Again the editor gives the reason: 'To those who read them it is a privilege and, let us hope, a great grace to be admitted into the secret workings of a soul so highly favoured by God, and to Irishmen and to Irishwomen there is added a natural feeling of pride in the fact that in holy Ireland Mary Aikenhead received the bright light of a Faith which she kept undimmed throughout her long and eventful life. It is not without emotion and deepest thankfulness that one reads of those early years when, through the agency of her humble but pious foster-parents, God sent His loving message to her heart and planted in her soul that virtue of fidelity to His voice which was to be the guiding principle of her religious life.'

Here lies the whole interest of the book. To the uninterested the letters are quite uninteresting. To the interested they are the revelation of a soul which every moment of its life says to itself, 'This one thing I do.' With truly wonderful consistency Mary Aikenhead worshipped the Lord in the beauty of holiness. Known in the Roman Church as Foundress of the Congregation of the Irish Sisters of Charity, she may now be known more widely by her gentle, calm anxiety for the welfare of her Foundation, but much more for her devoutness.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

That Clemens Alexandrinus has something which specially appeals to the modern mind is made manifest by the issue in close succession of three books on him and his writings. The first was a little volume of selections issued by the Quakers. The second was a large volume containing Professor Patrick's Croall Lectures. The third is a work in two volumes by the Rev. R. B. Tollington, B.D., Rector of Tendring. Mr. Tollington calls his book *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism* (Williams & Norgate; 21s. net), which is just a way of saying what we have said already, that Clement makes a special appeal to the modern mind, from the breadth of his sympathies and his toleration.

We do not need to travel far through this entrancing book to find how modern Clement is, how very modern are the people among whom Clement lived. Here is part of Clement's picture of the fine lady of Alexandria: 'So elaborate is the dressing and braiding of this lady's hair that she hardly dares to rest her head for fear of disarranging it. As grey hair comes, it must be dyed, and sometimes artificial additions must supplement the failing supplies of nature. Her "making up" is a long process, rarely omitted, in spite of the well-known evil effects of cosmetics on the skin. Soot was used for the eyebrows, white lead for the cheeks, but even so the result could not stand the

light of day. As was her appearance, so was her way of life. The days of such a woman seem to have been empty and tedious enough. Among her crowd of servants are few whose occupations tend to the solid comfort of her household, but many who are skilled in the refinements of the bath or the toilet, and some who are clever enough to beguile my lady's *ennui* by silly gossip or questionable stories. It is like mistress, like maid, and with some of her attendants she would be amazingly familiar, in spite of her horror at the thought that, if she were stripped of her finery, she would look exactly like one of the menials in her pay.

'Her pets, too, were an important element in her establishment. Lucian tells an amusing story of a philosopher in some great lady's employ who was told to look after her favourite dog. A pup or a parrot, a peacock or a monkey, would receive lavish attention. Clement's remark that this solicitude might better have been bestowed upon the aged or the poor, is possibly still applicable, even in some nominally Christian households. At times, when the pets grew tedious, she would receive visitors, and the effeminate and immoral dandy above described was usually among their number. It is a sorry but probably a true picture of a woman's life. In a later chapter we may see that, even for pagan womanhood, it was a one-sided and partial representation of the facts. Again, we must remind ourselves that Clement says the worst he can; he is speaking of women, and "corruptio optimae pessima."'

But there were finer ladies than these. Clement is not the man to make us enjoy his description of the evil elements in society and yawn over his account of the good. He is more interested even in the dress of the Christian ladies than in that of the pagan. This is Mr. Tollington's briefer résumé: 'Their clothing is white, like the men's, but of softer texture and more full in style. They wear white shoes. Out of doors they are veiled. They do not pay high prices when inexpensive materials will suffice. Their faces are free from cosmetics, as their clothing is free from dyes of rose, green, scarlet, purple, for "life is not a show." Unguents are not wholly forbidden them. Their hair, which is all their own, is fastened by a simple brooch. Like the men, they never hide their years. In the bearing of such a woman there is nothing loose or artificial; it is characterised by naturalness, grace, simplicity, and entire control.'

All this is lively enough. But Mr. Tollington is lively throughout. He makes Clement's theology as fascinating as Clement's Christian women. And from first to last he remembers his own resolve to show us a liberal Christian of the second century as a model for all advanced Christians of the twentieth.

The study of the English Bible will be taken up by the theological colleges some day, we believe. Meantime there are many Bible Study Circles and other agencies of the kind at work. And, in America, there are professors who condescend so far. One of them is a most competent teacher, and an enthusiast in the subject—Dr. L. M. Sweet, Professor of Christian Theology and Apologetics in the Bible Teachers Training School, New York. Professor Sweet has published a book and called it *The Study of the English Bible* (New York: Association Press; $1). He advocates the study of the Bible by its words, by its structure, book by book, and by historical periods. And in every chapter he proves that he knows his subject as well as the literature of it.

In the discussion of reunion one preliminary question has been unaccountably passed over. Is union (not unity) possible? Does any institutional religion exist without sects? Can such a religion continue self-contained? That is the question which Mr. A. C. Bouquet, M.A., has set himself to answer in a book which he calls *An Introduction to the Study of Efforts at Christian Reunion* (Cambridge: Heffer; 3s. 6d net). The study is historical and dispassionate. The conclusion is that, while Christianity shares in the vicissitudes of all institutional religions, it nevertheless shows signs of triumphing over them (just as it shows signs of triumphing in the moral sphere, inducing internationalism to such an extent that the world seems likely to grow to a unity sooner than the Church), and causing a loose federation of Christian communities to supersede the decadent Latin imperialism of the Mediterranean Church.

A volume of sermons selected from the MSS. of the late Robert Killip, F.R.A.S., has been published by Mr. Kelly, under the title of *Citizens of the Universe* (3s. 6d. net). Dr. Maldwyn Hughes writes a Foreword to the volume, in which he tells us that

early in his ministry Mr. Killip 'registered a vow to consecrate his life to the task of delivering his fellow Methodists from the tyranny of set phrases, and of seeking to give them a larger conception of the gospel.' Every sermon is evidence that that vow was kept, for every sermon is as large-minded as it is open-hearted, and as fresh as if it were written yesterday. And yet how different is all this from that 'breadth of the gospel' which leaves out the gospel.

The most painful aspect of the Criticism of the Bible is its bearing on the work of the Missionary. That aspect is handled both frankly and wisely by Principal A. E. Garvie in *The Missionary Obligation* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net). The full title is *The Missionary Obligation in the Light of the Changes of Modern Thought.* For it is not the Criticism of the Bible only that has caused disquiet; there are other movements to be appraised, such as the comparative study of Religion. This book will arrest and allay suspicion, if fairly read. It will do more, it will give new impulse to the missionary motive.

A series of lectures on health was delivered by celebrated London doctors at the Central Y.M.C.A., London, and they are now published in a small volume with the title *How to Keep Fit* (Jarrold; 1s. net). The subjects are of the most urgent necessity, and these eminent physicians have spoken out—Dr. W. McAdam Eccles on Alcohol, Sir Robert W. Burnet on Diet, Sir Dyce Duckworth on Clean-Mindedness, Sir R. Douglas Powell on Discipline, Sir G. H. Savage on a Sound Mind in a Sound Body, Dr. James Cantlie on Dress, and Sir Francis H. Champneys on Chastity.

The Book of Ruth, printed in unpointed Hebrew, as a text-book for study, may be had at the Manchester University Press (9d. net). It was prepared by the late Professor H. W. Hogg; the second edition is due to Professor M. A. Canney.

Never and Always is the title which the Rev. E. B. Wilson has given to his 'cure for care' (Marshall Brothers; 1s. net). It is 'never worry—always trust'; 'never hurry—always wait'; 'never murmur—always rejoice'; 'never be discouraged—always "press on"'; 'never faint—always pray.' What is the difference between fainting and being discouraged? Discouragement, says Mr. Wilson, is the growth of a certain lapse of time, but fainting is the result of something sudden and unexpected. And that he may not faint, he often prays, 'Lord, prepare me for what Thou art preparing for me.'

A biography has been written of Deborah Alcock under the title of *The Author of the Spanish Brothers* (Marshall Brothers; 6s.). Great care has been taken by the author of it, Elisabeth Boyd Bayly, not only to find the facts of the long life in Ireland and present them fairly, but also to make the life itself appear worthy of a biography so full as this. And she has certainly succeeded in giving us a book which it is a pleasure to read. Not once is there any flagging of interest. And this is the more surprising that the life was quite uneventful. It shows how little human life, in all that makes it good to live and good to read of, depends on outward events.

Those who are in the ministry in large cities are free to confess that their best workers often come from the country. Do they support the country churches as they ought? Dr. Edwin L. Earp, Professor of Sociology in Drew Theological Seminary, does not believe it. He has accordingly written a book on *The Rural Church Movement* (Meth. Book Concern; 75 cents net), to lay before them the case of the church in the country and encourage them to sympathize with a movement already begun and proceeding promisingly, to make more of the Rural Church.

No man in our time has written more about prayer than the Rev. Andrew Murray. He does not write systematic treatises like those of the old divines. He sends his thoughts forth in small volumes, believing that buckshot is more disconcerting to the Devil than cannon balls. His latest little book, *The Prayer-Life* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d.), which was issued in January of this year, has already gone into a second edition.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have also published a new volume by Mr. Philip Mauro. Its subject is *Baptism* (1s. net). It is divided into two parts: Part I. The Place and Importance of Baptism in Christianity; Part II. Concerning Household Baptism.

The Rev. Melville Scott, D.D., wisely pursuing

his studies in the doctrine of the Atonement, has now published the result of a study of Athanasius. The title is *Athanasius on the Atonement* (Stafford: Mort). What is the result of his study of Athanasius? It is to find that his own theory already published has been anticipated by Athanasius and therefore has the orthodox stamp upon it. In his last chapter he shows that this theory, though so old as Athanasius, is the most modern of all theories, and the most acceptable to our modern minds.

From the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches there comes a book on *The Land Problem for Christian Citizens*, written by Mr. Will Reason, M.A. (1s. net). The subject is in the hottest of hot water at present. But Mr. Reason is no partisan; and he knows.

Five of Professor Carl H. Cornill's most instructive lectures have been translated into English and published by the Open Court Publishing Company in Chicago under the title of *The Culture of Ancient Israel.* The topics of the lectures are—'Rise of the People of Israel,' 'Moses, the Founder of Monotheistic Religion,' 'The Education of Children in Ancient Israel,' 'Music in the Old Testament,' and 'The Psalms in Universal Literature.'

On the education of children he says: 'The foremost demand of our theory, that the individuality of the child must be allowed to develop, would have been as incomprehensible to the ancient Israelite as would have been the claim of woman to be an agent of the law. Obedience was the end and all. And since this is not apt to come of itself, it was necessary to resort to drastic measures. When we hear the proverb, "My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord; neither be weary of his reproof: for whom the Lord loveth he reproveth; he chasteneth the son in whom he hath delight" (Pr $3^{11.12}$), we need not wonder if the earthly father also lays ungentle hands upon his child for his own good. For "he that hath been delicately brought up from childhood will become a servant and end in misery" (Pr 29^{21}—Such is probably the sense of the corrupt and difficult passage.)'

The Heidelberg Catechism in its Newest Light, by Professor J. I. Good, D.D., LL.D. (Philadelphia: Offices of the Reformed Church), gives us the history of the work done on the Catechism and its influence during the last fifty years. The book is illustrated with a facsimile of the title-page of the original German edition and of the title-pages of translations into Latin, Dutch, French, Greek, Polish, Lithuanian, and many other languages.

The Rev. H. G. D. Latham, M.A., Vicar of S. George's, Camberwell, and formerly Dean of Perth in Western Australia, has published an Introduction to the Gospels under the title of *The Gospel according to the Four* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net). The volume contains full and useful analyses of the gospel history.

One of the best of the recent histories of the Old Testament has been written by the Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A., Principal of Culham Training College. Mr. Whitham has now written *A Short Old Testament History* (Rivingtons; 2s. 6d.), an abridgement of the other book, 'for the Junior Forms of schools and for the general reader who desires a plain summary of the Old Testament story from a Christian point of view without technicalities or discussion of difficulties, whether critical or historical.'

The Rev. Edward F. Wilson, 'late Principal of the Shingwauk Home for Indian Boys and of the C.M.S.,' has written a book to tell us what is *The Object of the Bible* (Stock; 2s. 6d. net). The object of the Bible is to inform the British nation that, being Israelites (they are the descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes), it is their mission to carry the gospel to the ends of the earth in accordance with the promise made to Abraham.

The Rev. W. G. Tarrant, B.A., has prepared and published a little book of *Home Prayers for Young People* (1s. net). It is issued by the Sunday School Association. Here is a prayer of thanksgiving for a holiday: 'O Thou Giver of happy days, for this day I bring my joyful thanks. Already its promises have made light my heart. Before I go forth, let my thoughts arise to Thee. Thy smile falls like sunshine upon all innocent mirth and healthful play. O great Friend of all little friends, may we all spend this day beneath that smile.

'If any pain or disappointment comes, help us to bear it bravely; and may we quickly find new happiness instead. May I try to help all the rest

to be very happy. And when the night comes round again, may it find us all made more truly blest by this sweet gift of Thine.—Amen.'

The Dean of Canterbury has published a second volume of papers contributed to *The Record* on *Some Questions of the Day* (Thynne; 3s. 6d. net). The papers are divided into four sets: (1) National and Ecclesiastical; (2) Convocation and the Church; (3) Scriptural and Doctrinal; (4) Practical Religion.

One of the papers in the Scriptural and Doctrinal section is on the Inspiration of Scripture. It is a testing topic. Dr. Wace is proud to share the belief of the Primitive Church. He quotes from Professor Swete's *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*: 'On the nature and extent of Inspiration, ancient Christian writers speak with an absence of reserve which is not in accordance with our present estimate. The Holy Scriptures were regarded as the writings of the Holy Spirit; anyone who did not believe that they were spoken by the Spirit was counted an unbeliever. The prophets were used by the Spirit as a workman uses his tools or a musician his flute.'

He then says: 'It ought surely to be felt that one of the gravest things that a Christian scholar or a Christian man can do is to adopt and to teach conclusions respecting the Scriptures which are, to say the least, not in harmony with these principles; and it is surely not less unquestionable that the views of the Old Testament which have of late been predominant in Germany, at Oxford, and at Cambridge, and those which are now being asserted at Oxford respecting the New Testament, are not compatible either with such a use of the Old Testament as was characteristic of our Lord and His Apostles, or with the view of the Gospels and the Epistles which prevailed in the Primitive Church.'

He admits, however, that 'the forms in which those views were expressed were in some cases too rigid and almost mechanical. The conception which some of the Fathers had of the method of Inspiration allowed sometimes, no doubt, too little to what has been called "the human element."'

Illustrations of Spiritual Truths from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall.'

By the Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E., Glasgow.

Vol. iii. p. 4. 'Themistius justly observes that, in the recent changes, both religions had been alternately disgraced by the seeming acquisition of worthless proselytes, of those votaries of the reigning purple who could pass, without a reason and without a blush, from the church to the temple, and from the altars of Jupiter to the sacred table of the Christians.'

Are not Christians of this type still the bane of true religion? To-day they are found at a revival meeting, to-morrow in some place of amusement of the most questionable character. One week you see them seemingly 'filled with the Spirit,' the next you may discover them 'drunken with wine, wherein is riot' (Eph 5^{18}). The inconsistencies, the time-serving, the faithlessness of nominal Christians, do more harm to Christianity than the open attacks of pronounced foes: proselytes of this type are 'worthless acquisitions,' and true religion is only 'disgraced' by their lip profession of adherence to Christian doctrine. 'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils' (1 Co 10^{21}).

Vol. iii. p. 20. 'In the government of his household, or of his empire, slight, or even imaginary, offences, a hasty word, a casual omission, an involuntary delay, were chastised by a sentence of immediate death. The expressions which issued the most readily from the mouth of the Emperor of the West were, "Strike off his head"; "Burn him alive"; "Let him be beaten with clubs till he expires." . . . The cages of two fierce and enormous bears, distinguished by the appellation of *Innocence* and *Mica Aurea*, were always placed near the

bed-chamber of Valentinian, who frequently amused his eyes with the grateful spectacle of seeing them tear and devour the bleeding limbs of the malefactors who were abandoned to their rage.' . . . (p. 65) 'His eyes, his voice, his colour, his gestures, expressed the violence of his ungoverned fury; and, while his whole frame was agitated with convulsive passion, a large blood-vessel suddenly burst in his body; and Valentinian fell speechless into the arms of his attendants . . . in a few minutes, the Emperor of the West expired in an agony of pain.'

'The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel' (Pr 12^{10}).

'As a roaring lion, and a ranging bear; so is a wicked ruler over a poor people' (Pr 28^{15}).

'To me belongeth vengeance, and recompence, at the time when their foot shall slide' (Dt 32^{35}).

'His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate' (Ps 7^{16}).

Vol. iii. p. 30. 'The ardour of Damasus and Ursinus, to seize the episcopal seat, surpassed the ordinary measure of human ambition. They contended with the rage of party: the quarrel was maintained by the wounds and death of their followers. . . . Damasus prevailed: the well-disputed victory remained on the side of his faction; one hundred and thirty-seven dead bodies were found in the *Basilica* of Sicininus, where the Christians held their religious assemblies.'

What a commentary on 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another' (Jn 13^{35})! and 'Doing nothing through faction or through vainglory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself' (Ph 2^{3}).

Vol. iii. p. 32. 'The standard of the Heruli and Batavians fell into the hands of the conquerors . . . The standard was recovered; but the Batavians had not redeemed the shame of their disgrace and flight in the eyes of their severe judge. . . . The troops were solemnly assembled; and the trembling Batavians were inclosed within the circle of the Imperial army. Valentinian then ascended his tribunal . . . The Batavians were degraded from their rank, stripped of their arms, and condemned to be sold for slaves to the highest bidder. At this tremendous sentence the troops fell prostrate on the ground, deprecated the indignation of their sovereign, and protested that, if he would indulge them in another trial, they would approve themselves not unworthy of the name of Romans, and of his soldiers. Valentinian . . . yielded to their entreaties: the Batavians resumed their arms.' They attacked the Alemanni with great valour, and routed the enemy before whom they had previously fled.

Are not defeated and disgraced soldiers in Christ's army still sent back to the field to retrieve their fallen honour? How many coward Peters have had 'another trial' afforded them by the great Commander, and in subsequent years 'approved themselves not unworthy of the name of Romans'!

'Back with thine angel to the field, and bravely do thy part.'

Vol. iii. p. 44. 'A valiant tribe of Caledonia, the Attacotti . . . are accused, by an eye-witness, of delighting in the taste of human flesh. When they hunted the woods for prey, it is said that they attacked the shepherd rather than his flock; and that they curiously selected the most delicate and brawny parts, both of males and females, which they prepared for their horrid repasts. If, in the neighbourhood of the commercial and literary town of Glasgow, a race of cannibals has really existed, we may contemplate, in the period of the Scottish history, the opposite extremes of savage and civilized life. Such reflections tend to enlarge the circle of our ideas: and to encourage the pleasing hope that New Zealand may produce, in some future age, the Hume of the Southern Hemisphere.'

Gibbon's conjecture has been amply fulfilled. The change in Scotland from the time when (if it was really the case) cannibalism was rife to its present foremost position among Christian nations is not more remarkable than that which has been witnessed in a single generation in many a group of the Pacific Islands. The frightful scenes of devilry and cannibalism in the Sandwich, Fiji, and New Hebrides Archipelagos have been superseded by the splendid triumphs of a rich and lasting

Christian civilization, which in many cases has produced men greater than Hume.

Vol. iii. p. 59. '[The Goths] marched with the proud confidence that their invincible valour would decide the fate of the Roman Empire; and the provinces of Thrace groaned under the weight of the Barbarians, who displayed the insolence of masters, and the licentiousness of enemies. But the intemperance which gratified their appetites retarded their progress; a chain of posts and fortifications, skilfully disposed by Valens . . . resisted their march, prevented their retreat, and intercepted their subsistence. The fierceness of the Barbarians was tamed and suspended by hunger; they indignantly threw down their arms at the feet of the conqueror, who offered them food and chains; the numerous captives were distributed in all the cities of the East.'

'Let not him that girdeth on his armour boast himself as he that putteth it off' (1 K 20^{11}).

'The prosperity of fools shall destroy them' (Pr 1^{32}).

Vol. iii. p. 69. 'The people, with their habitations, were swept away by the waters; and the city of Alexandria annually commemorated the fatal day on which fifty thousand persons had lost their lives in the inundation. . . . Their affrighted imagination enlarged the real extent of a momentary evil. They recollected the preceding earthquakes, which had subverted the cities of Palestine and Bithynia; they considered these alarming strokes as the prelude only of still more dreadful calamities, and their fearful vanity was disposed to confound the symptoms of a declining empire and a sinking world.'

'When ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not terrified . . . Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be great earthquakes, and in divers places famines and pestilences' (Lk 21^{9-11}).

Vol. iii. p. 90. 'A naked scymetar, fixed in the ground, was the only object of their [the Alani's] religious worship.'

These savages are not the only persons who have made a god of war, and 'in the love of arms, considered war and rapine as the pleasure, and the glory of mankind.' We read in Dn 11^{38} of one who 'in his estate shall honour the God of forces' (R.V. 'the God of fortresses'): and in the course of much modern history, it is easy to discover individuals, *e.g.* Napoleon, whose whole religion was little above that of these wild Alani. 'A naked scymetar,' the power of the sword, and the achievements which the sword can accomplish, formed their working religion from day to day.

Vol. iii. p. 97. 'At this important crisis, the military government of Thrace was exercised by Lupicinus and Maximus, in whose venal minds the slightest hope of private emolument outweighed every consideration of public advantage . . . The vilest food was sold [to the Goths] at an extravagant price; and, in the room of wholesome and substantial provisions, the markets were filled with the flesh of dogs, and of unclean animals, who had died of disease.' The Goths revolted; in their rebellion the Emperor Valens perished, and the Empire was shaken to its foundations.

Here, as so often in the history of the Empire, is exemplified the nemesis of sin. These two worthless generals acted as if it were 'sport to a fool to do mischief' (Pr 10^{23}), but they discovered that 'evil pursueth sinners' (Pr 13^{21}), that 'the house of the wicked shall be overthrown' (Pr 14^{11}), that 'he that is greedy of gain troubleth his own house' (Pr 15^{27}), for 'the crimes of Lupicinus were expiated by the ruin of the peaceful husbandmen of Thrace, the conflagration of their villages, and the massacre, or captivity, of their innocent families' (p. 101).

Vol. iii. p. 112. 'Valens was removed from the field of battle to a neighbouring cottage, where they attempted to dress his wound and to provide for his future safety. But this humble retreat was instantly surrounded by the enemy; they tried to force the door; they were provoked by a discharge of arrows from the roof, till at length, impatient of delay, they set fire to a pile of dry faggots, and consumed the cottage with the Roman Emperor and his train. Valens perished in the flames.'

Such was the end of one who had been an undisputed despot, a jealous tyrant, and a cruel persecutor of the Trinitarian party. His death illustrates the sayings, 'Riches profit not in the day of wrath' (Pr 11^{4}); 'His mischief

shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate' (Ps 7^{16}); and 'Verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth' (Ps 58^{11}).

Vol. iii. p. 127. 'The funeral of Athanaric was performed with solemn rites in the capital of the East; a stately monument was erected to his memory; and his whole army, won by the liberal courtesy and decent grief of Theodosius, enlisted under the standard of the Roman Empire.'

A striking instance of the value of Christian chivalry. Theodosius' action in showing such respect for a fallen foe—an Arian heretic—induced the entire Gothic nation to lay aside old bitterness and to accept the rule of Rome. And not infrequently to-day sympathy and true consideration shown to outsiders in their time of bereavement have led to their abandonment of their antagonistic attitude towards Christianity, and to their hearty surrender to the claims of Jesus Christ.

Vol. iii. p. 134 *n.* 'Valentinian was less attentive to the religion of his son, since he entrusted the education of Gratian to Ausonius, a professed pagan.' How often this practice is copied by modern parents! They give over the training of their offspring to persons whose moral character is unworthy, or they allow their sons, at the most plastic age, to come under the influence of teachers who set a false seal indelibly on their nature, and yet they imagine that no evil results will accrue from permitting such soiling association! If much of Gratian's later folly is traceable to Ausonius' early training, many a man to-day exhibits a similar bent for evil as the result of the kind of education which his father allowed him to have.

Vol. iii. p. 142. 'Theodosius had lately bestowed on his eldest son Arcadius the name and honours of Augustus; and the two princes were seated on a stately throne to receive the homage of their subjects. A bishop, Amphilochius of Iconium, approached the throne, and, after saluting with due reverence the person of his sovereign, he accosted the royal youth with the same familiar tenderness which he might have used towards a plebeian child. Provoked by this insolent behaviour, the monarch gave orders that the rustic priest should be instantly driven from his presence. But, while the guards were forcing him to the door, the dexterous polemic had time to execute his design, by exclaiming with a loud voice, "Such is the treatment, O Emperor! which the King of heaven has prepared for those impious men who affect to worship the Father but refuse to acknowledge the equal majesty of his divine Son." Theodosius immediately embraced the bishop of Iconium, and never forgot the important lesson which he had received from this dramatic parable.'

The 'parable' is an illustration of Jn 5^{23}, 'That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him'; and of 1 Jn 2^{23}, 'Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also.'

Vol. iii. p. 154. 'The Priscillianists absolutely condemned . . . marriage; . . . they enjoined a total abstinence from all animal food.' 'Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth' (1 Ti 4^{3}).

Vol. iii. p. 171. There was a wild sedition in Antioch, in which the statues of the Emperor were contemptuously thrown down. Theodosius imposed the severest penalties by way of retribution. The Imperial commissioners were sent to inflict the vengeance that had been decreed. But Chrysostom and others pleaded with the Emperor to pardon the guilty city. It was done. 'A free and general pardon was granted to the city and citizens of Antioch; the prison-doors were thrown open; the senators who despaired of their lives recovered the possession of their houses and estates; and the capital of the East was restored to the enjoyment of her ancient dignity and splendour.' 'A thousand new statues arose to the clemency of Theodosius; the applause of his subjects was ratified by the approbation of his own heart; and the emperor confessed that, if the exercise of justice is the most important duty, the indulgence of mercy is the most exquisite pleasure, of a sovereign.'

Is not this a faint reflexion of the joy of God in forgiving? He is Judge, and must correct,

and punish, and 'by no means clear the guilty.' Yet He 'pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage; he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy' (Mic 7^{18}). And His forgiveness is made possible by reason of the great Intercessor, for whose sake, and through whose merit, pardon is made possible (Ro 8^{34}, He 7^{25} 9^{24}, 1 Jn 2^{1}).

Vol. iii. pp. 172–175. The sedition of Thessalonica was followed by a treacherous massacre in which many thousands of both sexes were indiscriminately slaughtered. 'When Ambrose was informed of the massacre, his mind was filled with horror and anguish . . . He represented, in a private letter to the emperor, the enormity of the crime, which could only be effaced by the tears of penitence . . . He must not presume to approach the altar of Christ, or to receive the holy eucharist with those hands that were still polluted with the blood of an innocent people. The emperor was deeply affected . . . and, after he had bewailed the mischievous and irreparable consequences of his rash fury, he proceeded, in the accustomed manner, to perform his devotions in the great church of Milan. He was stopped in the porch by the archbishop; who, in the tone and language of an ambassador of Heaven, declared to his sovereign that private contrition was not sufficient to atone for a public fault or to appease the justice of the offended Deity. Theodosius humbly represented that, if he had contracted the guilt of homicide, David, the man after God's own heart, had been guilty, not only of murder, but of adultery. "You have imitated David in his crime, imitate then his repentance," was the reply of the undaunted Ambrose. The rigorous conditions of peace and pardon were accepted; and the public penance of the Emperor Theodosius has been recorded as one of the most honourable events in the annals of the Church.'

'Bring no more vain oblations . . . when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you . . . your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil: learn to do well' (Is $1^{13\text{-}17}$). 'Will ye steal, murder, and swear falsely, . . . and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered; that ye may do all these abominations? . . . Behold, I, even I, have seen it, saith the Lord' (Jer $7^{9\text{-}11}$).

Vol. iii. p. 187. 'The effeminate luxury which infected the manners of courts and cities had instilled a secret and destructive poison into the camps of the legions . . . The soldiers . . . complained of the weight of the armour, which they seldom wore, and they successfully obtained the permission of laying aside both their cuirasses and their helmets. The heavy weapons of their ancestors . . . insensibly dropped from their feeble hands . . . they reluctantly marched into the field . . . they preferred the ignominy of flight to the pain of wounds . . . The enervated soldiers abandoned their own and the public defence; and their pusillanimous indolence may be considered as the immediate cause of the downfall of the empire.'

All this is a striking commentary on Paul's words, 'Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong' (1 Co 16^{13}), and Eph $6^{11\text{-}18}$, 'Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil,' etc.

(*To be continued.*)

Contributions and Comments.

Luke xii. 4.

'Yea, I say unto you, fear him.' Who is it that Jesus reminds His disciples needs to be feared? In The Expository Times for June of this year, p. 397, it is assumed that it is God. 'Is there nothing in God to fear?' 'Yea,' says His Son, 'I say unto you, fear him.' Despite the number and authority of the commentators who agree with this view, the question must be raised, is the view tenable? We must note the following points.

(1) The fear in one part of the passage must

surely be the same kind of fear as the other part has in view, and that is fear of persecution, which implies a natural shrinking and dread. Is it conceivable that Jesus should say to the children of God (it is His own 'little flock' He is addressing), 'You do not need to shrink and shudder at the thought of persecution, but you do need to be so affected at the thought of God'?

(2) If it be God to whom Jesus is referring, the connexion with the verse immediately succeeding is not easily perceived. It sets forth God's loving tender care of His own, whose very hairs are all numbered, and Jesus Himself draws the inference 'fear not.' Does Jesus then mean 'fear not any painful experience life may bring, you are in the care or love of Him who notes a sparrow's fall, it is Him you have to fear'? Surely we cannot accept this, if there be possible any other interpretation. And there is.

(3) The parallel passage, Mt 10^{28}, puts it 'fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.' Now Rev 9^{11} speaks of him 'whose name in the Greek tongue is Apollyon,' *i.e.* the *destroyer*. It is not God, but the power of evil that destroys men, body and soul. And God's children have real enough need to dread that power. If we so understand the passage, it becomes perfectly plain and intelligible. 'There is only one thing to fear, and that is evil, and never cease to think of it with horror and shrinking, it destroys in time and in eternity. As for persecutions fear them not, you are in God's care.'

This is in agreement with the view of A. B. Bruce (see *Expositor's Greek Test.* in Mt 10^{28}), and it must at least be admitted, that in face of the above considerations this passage cannot be used as a clear proof that there is 'something to fear in God.' I do not, of course, deny that.

W. D. Niven.

Blairgowrie.

Boanerges.

The form and interpretation of this word still remain uncertain. The explanation recently advanced by Dr. Rendel Harris (vide *Boanerges*; Cambridge University Press, 1913), that the word is due to folklore, and means 'the twins,' is suggestive, but rather fanciful. We turn, however, to the form of the word, and suggest an explanation which has not been previously offered. The literal meaning of the term is said to be *υἱοὶ βροντῆς*. The latter part of the word might stand for רְגֹז (cf. Aram. *id.*, Targ. Mic 5^{15}). But this word almost invariably (Job 37^{2} a possible exception) signifies *agitation*, *raging*, in the sense of anger. The term might even arise from רֶשֶׁף, which is a Jewish Aramaic word meaning *flame*, *lightning*, and so become associated with *thunder*, but this cannot be pressed. The term בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף is rendered 'sparks' (R.V. marg., 'sons of flame,' Job 5^{7}). That a word meaning 'lightning' can come to be used in the sense of 'thunder' is indicated by the word בָּרָק, Syr. ܒܪܩ, 'lightning' (Dn 10^{6}). We find the compound בְּנֵיבֶרַק (Jos 19^{45}), lit. 'sons of lightning,' but perhaps = 'sons of thunder,' *i.e.* of the storm-god Rimmon (cf. Assyr. *Ramman-birḳu*). It is suggestive that Barak was called 'thunder-bolt' (*fulmen*; Cicero, *Pro Balbo*, xv.), just as the father of Hannibal was surnamed 'Barcas' (the Punic name for 'thunder') among the Carthaginians (*vide* Nepos, *Hamilcar*, i. 1). It is tempting to look with Jerome to רַעַם, but it is not easy to obtain *reges* or *erges* from this term. On the whole it is best to turn to רָגַשׁ, the root idea of which is *to make a vehement noise* (cf. Ps 2^{1}), though found with a somewhat different meaning in Aphel (Dn 6^{7}). A similar word is found in Arabic رجس, *rajasa*, and is the same in meaning as the Syriac ܪܓܫ, *to sound aloud*, hence *to thunder*. This word is well known in the Talmud, both as verb רָגַשׁ, *to shout tumultuously*, and as substantive רִגְשָׁא, *Geräusch*, *noise*, *storm*.

The former part of the word is still more difficult to explain. The quasi-diphthong *oa* constitutes the problem. Either vowel by itself would be capable of some tolerable explanation. It is always easy to cut the knot by suggesting a textual corruption or redactional error, and this of course may be the case in the present instance. But the reading *βοανηργές* is well supported, and must not be hastily emended. Dalman says: 'If Mark really wrote *oa*, his unfamiliarity with Aramaic was the cause' (*Words*, p. 49 n.). The suggestion here made is that if Mark really wrote *oa*, vernacular pronunciation was the cause. It is well known that in Galilee the vowel sounds were very broadly and inaccurately enunciated. It is probable that the short vowel sound, *sheva*, in many words was

sounded not as *a* or *o*, but as an inexact blending or slurring of the two letters. The sound consequently could best be represented by the juxtaposition of the two vowels. For the variants in the *sheva* sound compare רְחֹבֹת, which the LXX transliterate Ροωβὼθ, i.e. *sheva* = *o* (Gn 10^{11}); רְחַבְיָה, which the LXX transliterate Ραβία, i.e. *sheva* = *a* (1 Ch 23^{17}). Other confusions in Greek versions are doubtless due to the variant and uncertain sounds of the Semitic vowels. For example, the word תַּלְמַי (Targ. *id.*) is found in LXX as Θελαμί (Nu 13^{22}), Θολαμί (Jos 15^{14}), Θολμί (Jg 1^{10}, *et al.*), Θολμαὶ (1 Ch 3^{2}). Josephus has Θολομαῖος (*Ant.* xx. i. 1). The Codices A B have the additional forms Θαλμαί, Θολαμαί, Θολμεί, and most suggestive for our purpose Θοαλμεί. With this last form compare רְחַבְעָם, which the LXX rather strangely transliterate Ροβοὰμ. The conclusion is that the broad *oa* sound is to be retained, and that it is due to vernacular (probably Galilæan) pronunciation. The author of the second Gospel is here possibly writing from memory, not copying a document, and wrote the term phonetically, so that βοανηργές may fairly represent the north Palestinian pronunciation of the Aramaic בנירגש.

J. Courtenay James.

Harrogate.

St. John i. 29.

'Behold the Lamb of God.'

Every Christian sees and welcomes in these words a reference to the Coming Death of our Saviour Christ as a sacrifice for sin. At first sight it is perplexing and even amazing that they should be the words of John the Baptist, that before our Lord's ministry had even begun, John the Baptist should know and proclaim His sacrificial Death. It is especially wonderful when we consider that the Apostles themselves, after our Lord had died and risen again, after they had had the advantage of a long companionship with Him, still looked for a temporal kingdom (Ac 1^{6}), a fact which implies that they had no adequate idea of the value of our Lord's Death. We cannot be surprised that those who deny the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel should refuse to believe that John the Baptist uttered these wonderful words, and should regard them as the manifest invention of a later writer familiar with Apostolic preaching.

But by considering the life and character of St. John the Baptist, it may be possible to indicate by what steps he may have arrived at this wonderful faith, and how he may have been led on to recognize the great truth that our Lord would die a sacrifice for the sins of mankind.

John the Baptist had been marked out from the first as the forerunner of Christ. His preparation began in his earliest years. He was the son of a priest, born and brought up amid a sacrificial worship. Every day he would witness and perhaps take part in the offering of sacrifices. He would hear the details of the sacrifices continually spoken of at home, and spoken of in a reverent and devout spirit, as no mere ceremonial, but a true act of worship.

And if after witnessing a sacrifice, he turned to the books of the law, he would read that sacrifice was to be offered as an atonement for sin. It may be supposed that he accepted the truth of a real connexion between the sacrifices of the law, and the forgiveness of sin. He could not indeed have supposed the sacrifices to be directly efficacious, but his mind would be prepared to receive the great truth of a Sacrifice which *would* take away sin.

The loneliness of John the Baptist's life in the desert for so many years would assuredly quicken his perception of Divine truth. It would help him directly by giving him time and opportunity for meditation on the word of God, and the work of the Messiah, whose way he had been sent to prepare. It would help him also indirectly by keeping him out of the way of the Messianic ideas which pervaded the mass of the nation. It has been said that a desert-bred man has no patriotism (Robertson Smith on *Amos*). If it is true of Amos, it is true of John the Baptist, and we may at least be certain that he was free from the pseudo-patriotic notions of a conquering king, which were cherished by Scribes and Pharisees.

John the Baptist was a great preacher of repentance. He had a very strong and deep sense of sin: he believed not only in its guilt, but in its mystery. Yet like every other preacher of repentance, he had a strong belief in the possibility of forgiveness. And if sin was mysterious, might not forgiveness be mysterious too? And even though mysterious, must it not be declared by an act manifest to all the world? In such a way as this, the mind of the Baptist might have been prepared for the mystery of the Cross.

It is easy to point out passages in the prophets which may have helped John the Baptist to the utterance of the words we are considering. Is 53^{10}, Dn 9^{24} will occur to every one.

Lastly, the events of our Lord's baptism must have had an extraordinary effect on St. John's mind. If he really saw the heavenly Dove, if he really heard the Voice of God Himself, it must have lifted his whole heart and mind to heaven, it must have quickened his perceptions of Divine truth as they had never been quickened before. And if at the same time he recognized to the full the lowliness and gentleness of the Christ, surely the title 'Lamb' is a title which might well occur to him as fitly setting forth these great graces. And if the title 'Lamb' did occur to him as an appropriate title for our Lord's gentleness, I think it may be taken for granted that he would go on to ask himself whether our Lord was not also the Lamb of the sacrifice.

Thus we see how many ways there are in which John the Baptist could come near the great truth of our Lord dying as a sacrifice for sin, till at last the Divine Light broke in upon his soul, and led him to utter the prophetic words, 'The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.'

A. D. Mozley.

Oxford.

Lewisian and Curetonian Versions of the Gospels.

In our last article we tried to compare the evangelical quotations from the Old Testament found in St. Matthew's Gospel with the Lewisian and Curetonian Versions, and the conclusion of our inquiry was that, generally speaking, the Lewisian text is different from the wording used in the Old Testament Pshitta. If our attempt may claim a certain probability, the composition of the Lewisian Version ought to be assigned to an epoch not very far from the middle of the second century.

It would be useful to examine in the present study if we can find some linguistic proofs which would corroborate our assertion. In other words, if there are phonetic and morphologic features which make the Lewisian text more archaic than the most ancient Biblical and patristic writings that classical Syriac possesses, the above-mentioned date will receive a direct confirmation. We will refer in the following lines to the numbers of our Syriac Grammar entitled *Clef de la langue Araméenne* (Leipzig, 1905).

By a general principle of Semitic Philology we know that the letters called 'silent' were once sounded phonetically. In order to fit the old spelling, the orthography used in our days maintains them in some words, but very often, in order to stand closer to the prevailing pronunciation of the majority, it eliminates them completely. This principle is to be applied to the Aramaic language in a far more accentuated manner (11).

Now, the Lewisian Version explicitly exhibits some radical letters which are generally neglected, in pronunciation and in spelling, in the classic Aramaic of the end of the second century and onwards. The occurrence of this euphonic aphæresis is frequent in the Aramaic verbs meaning 'to go,' 'to come,' in which the first letter is always eliminated in the *imperative mood* (215); but the Lewisian text maintains it sometimes in such a constant way that we are tempted to state that this letter *Alaph* was pronounced at the time in which our Version saw the light. See in Matthew's Gospel, 5^{41} 8^{9} 9^{7} 11^{28} 19^{21} 21^{28} 22^{4} etc. This morphological fact is found in a more curious manner in the verbs used in the two following verses:—

19^{17}. *But if thou wouldest come to life, keep the commandments.* The *Nūn* of the verb meaning 'to keep' is nearly always eliminated in the imperative in classic Aramaic (137), as is generally the case for the verbs *Pé-Nūn* even in Hebrew. Our text, being very ancient, maintains this radical letter in the imperative mood derived from the aorist (207).

19^{25}. *And when the disciples heard it, they were astonished exceedingly, saying, Who then can be saved?* The Aramaic verb meaning 'to be saved' loses its *Iod* in the aorist and the tenses derived from it (135); this weak letter is maintained in the Lewisian text.

There are, too, in this newly discovered Version some very archaic Aramaic words to which we wish to draw attention:

4^{6}. *And saith unto him, If thou art the Son of God, fall from here.* The word used to express 'here' is very archaic. The original letter *Mîm* found in it has been changed in later generations to a *Résh*, as frequently happens in Syriac. Philologically this word stands for *Hâ-Men-Kâ*; the classic Syriac is *Har-Kâ*.

8^{29}. *And they cried in a loud voice, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?* The form by means of which the verb 'to torment' is presented, if it be rightly transliterated from the original, is very ancient, and the first *Tâu* found in it makes us think more of the Biblical Aramaic than of the classic Syriac.

9^{4-5}. *And* (Jesus), *knowing their thoughts, said to them, Wherefore think ye evil in your heart? Whether is easier to say, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise and walk?* In Syriac, what grammarians call 'logical neuter' (519) is expressed by the feminine gender. In these two verses the words 'evil' and 'easier' have the masculine gender as in Arabic. We deem that this syntatic fact in such a sentence is very archaic.

13^{52} $20^{1.\ 11}$ 21^{33}. *He said unto them, Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder . . . The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder . . . They murmured against the householder.* In all these sentences the first member of the word used for 'householder' is contracted of the word meaning 'lord,' and not 'Lord' with a capital letter. The same spelling used in 20^{8} leaves no room for doubt. I think that not many Aramaic scholars will contradict the statement that this morphological form is very ancient.

18^{17}. *If he heareth them not, tell it unto the church, and if he heareth not the church, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican.* The word used in this verse to express 'church' is surely archaic, meaning more a 'synagogue' of Jews than a church of Christians or a congregation of any other kind.

An important question arises at the end of this study: if the date assigned to the Lewisian text, at least for the Gospel of St. Matthew, be possibly the middle of the second century or even some years before, then this Version has preceded the famous Diatessaron of Tatian, which is a production of about 170 A.D. Can we find in Tatian's harmony internal proofs for the confirmation of this hypothesis? If the answer be affirmative, has Tatian then used the Lewisian text? If yes, was then the Diatessaron written in Syriac? We hope that our next article will discuss this tangled question, one of the most interesting in the history of New Testament criticism, always more by the way of facts than of theories.

ALPHONSE MINGANA.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Zia Bentley, Chichester.

Illustrations of the Great Text for November must be received by the 20th of September. The text is Ro 5^{20}.

The Great Text for December is Ps 51^{4}—

'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned,
And done that which is evil in thy sight:
That thou mayest be justified when thou speakest,
And be clear when thou judgest.'

A copy of Dobschütz's *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*, or Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for January is Phil 4^{19}—'And my God shall fulfil every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.' A copy of Dobschütz's *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Ro 8^{28}—'And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose.' A copy of any volume of the *Great Texts of the Bible*, or of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for March is Ro $7^{24.\ 25}$—'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is always something waiting for the diligent student of the Gospels. The Rev. Arthur WRIGHT, D.D., Vice-President of Queens' College, Cambridge, has studied the Gospels diligently all his life. He has now made a most interesting discovery, which he announces in *The Interpreter* for July.

Most discoveries are made in the search for causes. The fact to be accounted for here is the extraordinarily miscellaneous way in which the narratives in the life of Christ, and especially His sayings, are distributed throughout the first three Gospels. An obvious and easy explanation is that the disarrangement was already in the great source, called Q, from which the evangelists drew so much of their material. And so far as it goes that explanation is probably true. For it is one of the assured results of criticism that Q was a distinctly amorphous document. And so, when St. Matthew tried to arrange in some order the material which he took from Q—and chronologically if possible—he gathered it into five long groups, while St. Luke arranged his material in twenty-four short groups. But, after all, that explanation only throws the difficulty a little farther back. Why was Q so chaotic? If the Synoptic Gospels found their source in confusion, what caused the confusion?

The answer probably is that Q had no clear idea of the chronology of the works of Christ, much less of His words. That is probable even to those who hold by documents and nothing else as the sources of the Gospels. To Dr. WRIGHT, who believes that the Gospels were largely due to direct reports of oral teaching, it is still more probable. Well, if the editor of Q did not know the order of events and sayings, and yet had to set them down somehow, what principle would he be likely to go upon? No doubt those that would fit in chronologically would be fitted in first. Then those that were alike in subject-matter would be thrown together. But there was one device left. What that device was is Dr. WRIGHT'S discovery.

It was the use of catchwords. The use of catchwords is not confined to the Gospels. The editor of Q must have been familiar with it, as it occurs in the Psalms and in the Prophets. Suppose that some Temple musician or scribe had before him a collection of psalms without historical prefaces or conclusions. He had to arrange them for synagogue reading and teaching. He would follow the hints of chronology as far as he could. When that aid failed him he would work on the subject-matter. Last of all he would call to his help the use of catchwords. The editor of Q followed the same method; and the evangelists carried it out still more fully after him.

Take Mk 11[26]: 'And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any one, that your Father which is in the heavens may forgive you your transgressions.' The mere tyro in criticism, says Dr. WRIGHT, will see that this saying has no connexion with what precedes or what follows it. He calls it 'a misplaced boulder.' How did it fall into this position? It belongs to Q. It is one of the few utterances of our Lord which St. Mark has taken from that source. It is clear also that it belongs to that edition of Q which was used by St. Matthew; for the phrase 'your Father which is in the heavens' is notoriously Matthæan. The utterance is not found in St. Luke, the nearest approach being the saying on the cross, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do,' and that saying is not genuine.

Now, when St. Matthew was arranging the material which he took from Q, he placed this saying in the great group which we call the Sermon on the Mount. For he observed its connexion in subject-matter with one of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. He did not, of course, interrupt the Prayer itself, to make the insertion. But he added it after, as if it had been spoken by our Lord by way of commentary on one of the petitions, or in order to give that particular petition peculiar impressiveness.

But St. Mark has no Sermon on the Mount. Why did he, or why did Q before him, place the saying just where we now find it? The simplicity of the answer is almost amusing. The eye of the editor of Q was caught by the word 'pray' in it. That word occurs in the saying which immediately precedes. It was the last resource, but it sufficed. Because both sayings had this one catchword they were set down together.

There is a more convincing example in Mk 9[49]. In that passage we have three utterances concerning salt. 'For every one will be salted with fire'—that is one. 'Salt is good, but if the salt shall become saltless, wherewith will ye season it?'—that is another. 'Have salt in yourselves and be at peace with one another'—that is the third.

The first and the third of these utterances are peculiar to St. Mark. The second was found in a longer form in Q. St. Luke took it and inserted it in his fourteenth chapter. St. Matthew changed 'Salt is good' into 'Ye are the salt of the earth,' in order to balance with 'Ye are the light of the world,' and then placed both the clauses in the Sermon on the Mount. But why did St. Mark put all the three together?

He knew nothing about their chronology—we may be sure of that. They are not connected by subject-matter. Quite independent sayings, it is easy to see the force of them when taken alone; it is impossible to bring them into line with one another, as the wonderful variety of efforts so to do has abundantly shown. The only explanation is the catchword 'fire.' That word occurs in the preceding verse: 'Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.' The other three homeless but priceless sayings about fire found a resting-place beside that saying.

One of the most dreadful doctrines in our fathers' eyes was the doctrine of Patripassianism. It is one of the most delightful doctrines to us. How that great change has come about it is not very easy to say. The chief cause is perhaps our renewed interest in the doctrine of the Atonement. The sight of the Suffering Son leaving the Father unmoved came to be intolerable to our modern sense. The question was asked: Is it then impossible that God should suffer? And no sooner was it asked than the answer came that it is altogether fitting and beautiful and blessed.

It cannot be said to be a commonplace yet of the pulpit. Will it ever become a commonplace? Is it not too great to be compassed, too gracious to be exhausted? For the present, at any rate, it is the freshest and most arresting of all the doctrines

of Christianity. And it is no surprise to find that a volume of sermons by Professor WARFIELD of Princeton does not end until it has set forth this doctrine without reserve.

The title of the volume is *The Saviour of the World* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is in the last sermon that this doctrine is declared. It is called, 'a very great and marvellous thing,' this doctrine of God's self-sacrifice and suffering. Again, it is called 'a wonderful thing.' For to Professor WARFIELD at least it is no commonplace yet. 'Men tell us that God is, by the very necessity of His nature, incapable of passion, incapable of being moved by inducements from without; that He dwells in holy calm and unchangeable blessedness, untouched by human sufferings or human sorrows for ever, haunting

The lucid interspace of world and world,
Where never creeps a cloud, nor moves a wind,
Nor ever falls the least white star of snow,
Nor ever lowest roll of thunder moans,
Nor sound of human sorrow mounts to mar
His sacred, everlasting calm.

But it is not true. 'Let us bless our God,' says Dr. WARFIELD, 'that it is not true. God can feel; God does love. We have Scriptural warrant for believing, as it has been perhaps somewhat inadequately but not misleadingly phrased (the qualification is truly Warfieldian), that moral heroism has a place within the sphere of the Divine nature.' And when he is charged with 'gross anthropomorphism,' he answers heroically, 'We are careless of names: it is the truth of God.'

Although religion has for a long time been making approaches to science and science has for a short time been making approaches to religion, it must not be supposed that the two are just about to become one. It must not be expected that in the near future the scientific man will be found to be religious and the religious man scientific. It ought to be so. In every case it ought to be so. But it is not likely to be so for a long time to come.

It ought to be so. Every man of education ought to be both scientific and religious. For science and religion are alike based on fundamental natural instincts. They appear spontaneously all over the world. Moreover, they naturally tend to appear in the same individual in such a way that each impulse is dependent on the other for its full development. No man, therefore, is the man he ought to be unless he is both scientific and religious.

Time was—you will find the story of it in an article which Dr. Havelock ELLIS has contributed to *The Atlantic Monthly*—time was when every thinking man was both scientific and religious. It is a long time ago. To find it you must go back to what is called primitive times. Or, what is the same thing, you will find it if you cross the earth to what are called primitive peoples to-day. With rare exceptions, so rare as to be fairly called abnormal, the thinking man, the clever man, the shaman or whatever name he goes by, is both scientific and religious. He may not be highly scientific and he may not be deeply religious. But the point is that when he is the one he is also the other. The 'medicine-man' of all primitive races is both scientific and religious. His science helps his religion and his religion his science. Like the Hebrew prophet, who also was primitive in this as in some other respects, he uses his knowledge, whether of the weather or of the ways of men, to make more impressive his devotion; and he uses his devotion to inspire confidence in his knowledge.

The religion of the medicine-man is very poor religion, and his science is very poor science. But then, in combining religion and science in one person, he is more in harmony with the universe than is the modern man of science with all his knowledge, if he is only scientific; or the modern man of religion with all his piety, if he is only religious. It may be asserted that the shaman is not scientific enough because he has practised

religion along with his science, and it may be argued that he is not religious enough because he has practised science along with his religion. But that does not alter the fact that science and religion should be practised together. Give the shaman true science and true religion, and having both he is a greater man than if he were a Darwin or a Teresa.

Is it not possible to practise both together? It seems to be very difficult. Dr. Havelock ELLIS believes that we are born with both instincts. But from our birth we may have a bias in favour of the one or the other. That bias we encourage. It appears to us in our ignorance to be the proper thing to do. We ought, we say, to follow the bent of our nature. The result is a state of atrophy of the one instinct and of hypertrophy of the other. And then comes antagonism. Darwin does not understand Teresa, and Teresa does not approve of Darwin. There ought to be no antagonism. It is due to a morbid state in both. Strip Teresa of her atrophied pseudo-science, which in her case is mostly theological science, and there is nothing in her attitude which would not harmonize with and exact that absolute adoration and service to natural truth which inspired Darwin. Strip Darwin of that atrophied feeling for poetry and the arts which he deplored, and that anæmic secular conception of the universe as a whole (these are the words of Dr. Havelock ELLIS) which he seems to have accepted without deploring, and there is nothing in his attitude which would not serve to fertilize and enrich the spiritual exaltation of Teresa, and even to remove far from her that temptation to *accidie* or slothfulness which all mystics who are mystics only have recognized as their besetting sin, minimized as it is in Teresa by her practical activities.

If it is difficult to practise science and religion together, it is more difficult to restore the balance when it has once been lost. See the man who has suddenly become alive to the fact that he is hypertrophied on the one side and atrophied on the other, see him as he attempts to remedy his onesidedness, 'The heroic and ostentatious manner,' says Dr. Havelock ELLIS, 'in which ill-balanced people hastily attempt the athletic feat of restoring their balance has frequently aroused the interest, and too often the amusement, of the spectator.'

He recalls Sir Isaac NEWTON—'the most quintessentially scientific person the world has seen.' In his old age Sir Isaac NEWTON realized that the vast hypertrophy of his faculties on the scientific side had not been compensated by any development on the side of religion. 'He forthwith set himself to the interpretation of the Book of Daniel, and puzzled over the prophecies of the Book of Revelation, with the same scientifically serious air that he would have assumed in analyzing the spectrum. In reality he had not reached the sphere of religion at all; he had merely exchanged good science for bad.'

And then he turns to Sir Oliver LODGE. 'It would be a double-edged compliment,' he says, 'in this connexion, to compare Sir Oliver LODGE with Sir Isaac NEWTON. But after devoting himself for many years to purely physical research, LODGE also, as he has confessed, found that he had overlooked the religious side of life, and therefore set himself with characteristic energy to the task—the stages of which are described in a long series of books—of developing this atrophied side of his nature. Unlike NEWTON, who was worried about the future, LODGE became worried about the past. Just as NEWTON found what he was contented to regard as religious peace in speculating on the meaning of the Books of Daniel and Revelation, so LODGE found a similar satisfaction in speculations concerning the origin of the soul, and in hunting out tags from the poets to support his speculations. So fascinating was this occupation that it seemed to him to constitute a great "message" to the world. "My message is that there is some great truth in the idea of pre-existence, not an obvious truth, nor one easy to formulate,—a truth difficult to express,—not to be

identified with the guesses of reincarnation and transmigration, which may be fanciful. We may not have been individuals before, but we are chips or fragments of a great mass of mind,-of spirit, and of life—drops, as it were, taken out of a germinal reservoir of life, and incubated until incarnate in a material body."'

'The genuine mystic,' says Dr. Havelock ELLIS, —and by mystic he simply means religious person, —'would smile if asked to accept as a divine message these phraseological gropings in the darkness, with their culmination in the gospel of "incubated drops." They only show that when the hypertrophied man of science seeks to cultivate his atrophied religious instincts it is with the utmost difficulty that he escapes from science. His conversion to religion merely means that he has exchanged sound science for pseudo-science.'

Nor does Dr. Havelock ELLIS think it any easier for the man with hypertrophied religious instincts to recover his balance by cultivating his atrophied scientific interests. The religious man does not so often try to do so. He more rarely sees any occasion for it. For the instinct of religion develops earlier in the history of a race than the instinct of science. It is also more fundamental. The man who has found the massive satisfaction of his religious cravings is seldom at any stage conscious of scientific cravings; he is apt to feel that he already possesses the supreme knowledge. Genuinely religious men who have exercised their scientific instincts have generally found scope for the exercise within an enlarged theologica scheme which they regarded as part of their religion. In that way Augustine found scope for his full and vivid, if capricious, intellectual impulses, and in that way Aquinas, 'in whom there was less of the mystic and more of the scientist, found scope for the rational and orderly development of a keen intelligence which has made him an authority, and even a pioneer, for many who are absolutely indifferent to his theology.'

The Rev. J. D. JONES, M.A., B.D., has published a volume of sermons and called it *The Gospel of the Sovereignty* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). The title is significant. Whether it belongs to the whole volume we cannot yet tell. It belongs to the first sermon in it. And it is significant that that is the subject of *any* sermon in the volume. It is significant that that sermon has been placed first.

For we have heard little of the Sovereignty of God for a long time now. It has all been of God's Fatherhood. There was a certain system of theology which was built upon God's Sovereignty. That system, almost as long as we can remember, has been out of favour. It has not been forgotten. There is something about it that makes forgetfulness impossible, but it has been greatly spoken against. The very name of Calvinism has been a byword and a reproach. But no system of theology has ever used the Sovereignty of God as Calvinism has done. And the Sovereignty of God is coming to its own again.

In coming to its own it is not going to overwhelm the doctrine of God's Fatherhood. The pendulum is on the turn; but it is not going to swing so far the other way as to make us forget the Fatherhood—a doctrine which was gained for us and our generation not without tears. Mr. JONES preaches the gospel of the Sovereignty, but 'I too,' he says, 'rejoice in the Fatherhood of God: I delight to proclaim God's tenderness and compassion and infinite love.' It may be that for a time the preacher of the Sovereignty will have to preach it almost exclusively. For pendulums do not swing of themselves. We have gone so far away from it, and with such disastrous consequences, that it may be necessary to accept the appearance of forgetting the Fatherhood for a little that the Sovereignty may come to its own again.

The consequences have been disastrous. 'We are living,' says Mr. JONES, 'in a rather limp and flaccid time. The intellectual temper of our day

is that of a genial humanitarianism. Our manners are soft, our beliefs are invertebrate. And the Church's condition corresponds somewhat to the condition of the age. For years now we have been bemoaning our ineffectiveness and lack of power. The fact is, a genial humanitarianism will never carry a Church to victory. What we need is a new vision of God—the Mighty God. Men have called the Puritan religion "the Hard Church." But is it not time, as Professor PEABODY says, to face the perils of "the Soft Church"? That is our peril to-day—the peril of the Soft Church. We want a breath of the Puritan's bracing faith. For Churches and for men it remains eternally true—"the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."'

A Solution of the Chief Difficulties in Revelation xx.-xxii.

By the Rev. R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A., Canon of Westminster.

In the year 1892 I was struck by the remarkable contradictions existing in the text of the above chapters. To some of these I drew attention in my first edition of the *Book of Enoch* in 1893, where on p. 45 I wrote as follows: 'We have here (*i.e.* Rev $21^{1.2}$) a new heaven and a new earth, and a New Jerusalem coming down from heaven: yet in 22^{15} all classes of sinners are said to be without the gates of the city. But if there were a new earth, this would be impossible.' This is only one of the many difficulties that confront the serious student of these chapters. Now, to make the problem before us clear, it will be best to deal shortly with a few of the passages which make it impossible for us to accept the text as it stands.

1. In 20^{7-10} after the close of the Millennial Kingdom, Satan is loosed, and the nations (Gog and Magog) which have refused to accept the Christian faith, march against Jerusalem and the camp of the saints, but are destroyed by fire from heaven. Satan also is cast finally into the lake of fire and brimstone to be tormented there for ever and ever. *Thus the prime source of evil and his deluded followers (Gog and Magog) are removed finally from the world, and their power to influence the world for evil made impossible for ever.*

2. In 20^{11-15} the old earth and the old heaven are given over to annihilation. Then the final judgment takes place, and all the dead are judged according to their works, and death and Hades are cast into the lake of fire, together with all whose names are not found written in the book of life. *At this stage we have arrived at the final overthrow of all evil, together with the destruction of death itself.*

3. Now that all evil and death itself are cast into the lake of fire, the new heaven and the new earth come into being, and the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven, and God Himself dwells with men (21^{1-4}).

It is clear from this passage that we have arrived at the closing scene of the great world struggle between good and evil, and that henceforth there can be neither sin, nor crying, nor pain, nor death any more. In fact, there can be no place at all for these in the universe of God—the new heaven and the new earth and the New Jerusalem that cometh down from God to the new earth.

The conclusion just arrived at is inevitable, if there is a steady development in the visions of the Seer. Now since such a development is manifest in chapters 1–20, when certain verses and glosses are excised, and a few disarrangements of the text set right—especially that in 18—we naturally conclude that our author will not lightly fall into contradictions, even of a minor sort, in the last three chapters. But unhappily this is not our experience as we study them; and at last we stand aghast at the hopeless mental confusion which dominates the present structure of these chapters, and are compelled to ask if they can possibly come from his hand, and, in case they do so, to ask further, if they have been preserved as they left his hand.

But we must first justify the above statement, though we shall adduce here[1] only a few of the main contradictions in these chapters.

[1] Others will be brought to light in the rearranged text which is printed at the close of this study.

1. Inasmuch as according to our text the New Jerusalem does not come down from heaven till Satan is bound for ever in the lake of fire, and all sin and death itself are at an end, and the place of the old world has been taken by a new and glorious world, wherein there is neither spot nor blemish nor any such thing, how is it that we are told that, outside the gates of the New Jerusalem which has come down from God to the new earth, there are 'the dogs and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters, and every one that loveth and maketh a lie' (22[15])? A greater contradiction in thought and statement is hardly conceivable. But if this statement were made in connexion with the Millennial Kingdom, everything would be intelligible.

2. Again, since the new earth is inhabited only by the blessed, on whom the second death could have no effect, and since these are all righteous, and God Himself tabernacles among them, how is it that in 22[2] the leaves of the tree of life are said to be for the healing of the nations? This statement can have no meaning unless it applies to the period of the Millennial Kingdom. During Christ's reign of 1000 years, the surviving nations have still a further period of grace accorded to them. This evangelizing of the nations during this period has already been proclaimed in 14[6-7] 15[4]. It is twice elsewhere referred to in the last two chapters, *i.e.* 20[14] 22[14].

3. Only on the supposition that the Millennial Kingdom is still in existence can we explain 21[24-27]:

'And the nations shall walk by the light thereof:
And the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it.
And the gates thereof shall not be shut day *or night*.'[1]

'And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it:
And there shall not enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination or a lie;
But only they which are written in the book of life of the Lamb.'

[1] A necessary emendation. The corruption in the text arose from the present disorder, and the influence of 22[5], 'and there shall be no more night,' where this clause is wholly justifiable.

Now from the above contradictions—the solution of which is in part already suggested—it follows either that (*a*) a considerable part of 20–22 is not from the hand of our author, or that, (*b*) if it is from his hand, it is disarranged.

Now the solution offered by (*a*) is that which has been adopted by most of the leading German scholars of the past thirty years. Thus with Völter (*Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1904), Weyland (*Omwerkings-en Compilatie-Hypothesen toegepasst op de Apocalypse van Johannes*) and J. Weiss (*Die Offenb. des Johannes*, 1908) assume that 20–22 is derived from three different sources, Spitta (*Die Offenb. des Johannes*, 1889) finds traces of four authors, while Erbes (*Die Offenb. Johannis*, 1891) and, on the whole, Bousset (1906) are content with two. Bousset, in fact, regards 20–22 as the work of the Apocalyptist, with the exception of the fragment 21[9]–22[5].

But, even though for the time being we yield to the arguments of any one of these scholars for a plurality of authorship, we have still two insuperable difficulties to face. (α) The first of these is that *the more closely we study* 1–20[3], *the more convinced we become of the structural unity of these chapters*—a fact which does not exclude the occasional use and adaptation of sources—*and the clear and masterly development in thought, working up steadily to a climax. This being so, how is it that* 20–22 *shows no such orderly development but rather a chaos of conflicting conceptions?* (β) But the second difficulty is still greater. The hypotheses of the above scholars, with the partial exception of Bousset, break down hopelessly in the face of the general linguistic unity of 20–22. In fact, these scholars were lacking in an exact knowledge of the style, vocabulary, and grammar of the Apocalypse. Bousset, it is true, has done much to compensate for the deficiencies of his predecessors in this field, but a deeper study of his materials would have precluded his assuming the existence of 21[9]–22[5] as an independent source, seeing that it is internally self-contradictory and that yet *linguistically it is from the hand of our author.* To the conclusion, in fact, that, with the exception of a few verses, chapters 20–22 are from the same hand to which we owe the bulk of the preceding chapters, a close and prolonged study has slowly but irresistibly brought me. If, then, this is so, we must conclude that the text in 20–22 *is disarranged in an astonishing degree and does not at present stand*

in the orderly sequence originally designed by our author.

To what cause, we must now ask, is this all but incredible disorder due? It cannot be accounted for by accidental transpositions of the text in the MSS—a phenomenon with which the students of MSS in every ancient language are familiar. For no accident could explain the intolerable confusion of the text in 20^{4}–22, and apparently the only hypothesis that can account for it is that which a comprehensive study of the facts forced upon me some eight months ago, and this is that *John died either as a martyr or by a natural death, when he had completed* 1–20^{3} *of his work, and that the materials for its completion, which were for the most part ready in a series of independent documents, were put together by a faithful but unintelligent disciple in the order which he thought right.*

This hypothesis we shall now proceed to establish by adequate proofs, though the full evidence can be given only in my commentary, by far the greater part of which is already completed.

1. First of all, it is a matter beyond dispute that 22^{15} 21^{27}, which state that outside the gates of the New Jerusalem evil in every form exists but that it can in no wise pass within the gates of the holy city, prove that *the New Jerusalem here referred to was to descend before the disappearance of the first earth and the first heaven and the final judgment* described in $20^{11\text{-}15}$. A kindred expectation is found in 4 Ezra $7^{26\text{-}28}$, where the heavenly Jerusalem,[1] the Messiah, and those who had been translated to heaven without seeing death are to be manifested together on the earth for 400 years. The same view appears in the same work in $13^{32\text{-}36}$. In this latter passage evil in every form exists outside the heavenly city.

From the above facts we conclude that in our author the account of the New Jerusalem should have been inserted after 20^{3}.

2. Verses 22^{2} $21^{24\text{-}26}$ $22^{14.\ 17}$ assume that the nations are still upon the earth, that the gospel is preached to them afresh from the New Jerusalem (as was prophesied already in 14^{6} 15^{4}); that they are healed thereby of their spiritual evils, their sins washed away, and a right to eat of the tree of life given to them. And to this salvation they are bidden of the Spirit and the New Jerusalem (*i.e.* the bride, 22^{17}).

[1] Box, it is true, regards 7^{26}, which tells of the manifestation of the heavenly Jerusalem, as an interpolation.

In 1 Enoch 90^{30} (161 B.C.) we find this expectation of the conversion of the surviving Gentiles after the advent of the New Jerusalem from heaven.

That the above prophecies can apply only to the New Jerusalem, which was to be the seat of the Millennial Kingdom, is too obvious to dwell on further.

3. It is finally to be observed that, since the earthly Jerusalem was in ruins and never in the opinion of the Seer to be rebuilt, a new city was of necessity to take its place as the seat of Christ's kingdom and the abode of the blessed martyrs, who were to come down from heaven to reign for 1000 years with Him. Since this new city was to be the abode of Christ on His Second Advent from heaven and of the martyrs coming down from heaven with Him in their glorified bodies, it follows that the new city must be from heaven also, if it was to be a fit abode for its inhabitants from heaven. Even as early as 161 B.C. (as we have already mentioned above), we have a like expectation in Enoch $90^{28\text{-}38}$, where it is said in the vision that God Himself set up the New Jerusalem, to be the abode of the Messiah and the transformed and glorified Israel.

From the above facts the conclusion is inevitable that after 20^{3} *our author had intended to add a description of the New Jerusalem that was to come down from heaven and be the habitation of Christ and the martyrs that accompanied Him from heaven in their glorified bodies:* and *also that this very description has been preserved in certain sections of* 21–22.

We have next to determine the extent of this description. Now even the cursory reader will observe that there are two accounts of the New Jerusalem in these chapters, which have been rudely thrust together by the Seer's literary executor. A close study of these chapters will show that the section 21^{9}–22^{2} constitutes a unity, though incomplete in itself, as we shall see presently, and gives a description of the New Jerusalem that was to be the centre of the Millennial Kingdom. Two further fragments of this description are to be found in $22^{14\text{-}15}$ and ^{17}. This description fits in perfectly with the conditions of the millennial reign of Christ and the martyrs for 1000 years. It is conceived of as a period of beneficent rule and evangelizing effort in regard to the surviving nations who visit the New Jerusalem and bring all their

glory and honour into it. Wickedness, of course, still exists without it, but nothing that is unclean nor any liar or abominable person is permitted to enter into it (22^{15} 21^{2}).

So far for the first description. But what are we to make of the second, which begins with 21^{1}? Only the *disjecta membra* of this description remain. Two fragments of it are recoverable in 21^{1-4c} and 22^{3-5}. These should be read together, as the first clause of 22^{3} forms the last line of the stanza, the first three lines of which are preserved in 21^{4abc}.

In this second description the former heaven and earth have passed away for ever, with all the sin and sorrow and pain that prevailed on the former earth. Death itself shall be no more throughout the new heaven and the new earth and the New Jerusalem (21^{4}). And whereas in the New Jerusalem that came down from God for the Millennial Kingdom the saints reigned only 1000 years, in the later New Jerusalem they are to reign for ever and ever (22^{5}).

(*To be concluded.*)

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Candle of Life.

By the Rev. William Upright.

'The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord.'—Pr 20^{27}.

There was a time when candles were often used in public worship. In the early days of Christianity the followers of Jesus were so bitterly persecuted that they could meet together only at night, or in dark underground places. Thus they needed artificial light, and as they were not rich people they made use of candles, which could be cheaply and easily obtained. In time it came to be thought that the candles represented something, such as 'the Light of the World' or 'the light of faith,' and when these meanings were given to them, they were soon regarded as a necessary part of public worship, to be lit at every service, even when their light was not required. This practice is still retained in the Roman Catholic Church, but it has been laid aside by the Protestant churches as unnecessary and superstitious. I think we shall all agree that at the present day candles are more useful in the kitchen than in the church, but there is one candle at least, which should burn brightly in the church as well as in the home. It is called 'The Candle of Life.'

The Book of Proverbs says, 'The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord,' and one of our great poets speaks about 'the vital spark of heavenly flame' that burns within the breast. When people wish to speak about the shortness of life they often compare it to the glimmer of a spark, which glows for a moment in the darkness and then dies away.

But what is the origin of the spark? Where does it come from? What is the Source of this light within us, which we call Life?

If you ask some savage tribes about the origin of fire, they tell you that there was a time when people did not know how to make fire, and it came down from heaven as a gift from the gods. That is why many savages regard fire as sacred. When the lightning sets fire to a tree, they put all their fires out and relight them again at the fresh supply which their gods have sent. Of course, our scientists have another explanation. They tell us that lightning is due to what are known as 'natural causes,' and therefore fire can no longer be regarded as a direct gift from heaven. Now some people are afraid that just as the scientist has explained the origin of fire, so he will also explain the origin of life. But there is no need to be afraid. Whatever science may have to teach about this subject, it will always be right to regard our life as a gift from God. 'The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord.'

In ancient Rome there was a temple for the worship of Vesta—the Goddess of Fire, and in that temple the sacred fire was always burning in honour of the goddess. The candles were trimmed and the fires tended by six virgins, who guarded the temple night and day. The sacred fire could not be used for any unlawful purpose; it must all be devoted to Vesta, who was thought to have given men the precious gift of fire. If any one had entered the temple and taken the sacred fire for his own uses, he would have been guilty of a great crime—the crime of sacrilege. That is what we are guilty of

when we take the sacred gift of life and use it in base and unworthy ways.

Sometimes you hear it said that 'So-and-so is burning the candle at both ends.' What does it mean? It means that he is wasting his life. Soon the light shall be dark in his tabernacle and his candle shall be put out with him. Do not let us 'burn the candle at both ends,' but rather let us live so that our lives may be like the candles in the temple of Vesta, sending forth a pure and holy sacrificial flame to the honour and glory of the Giver of Life. 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.'

> Jesus bids us shine with a clear pure light,
> Like a little candle burning in the night;
> In this world of darkness we must shine,
> You in your small corner and I in mine.

Household Foes.

'A man's foes shall be they of his own household.'—Mt 10^{36}.

Jesus was sending out His twelve disciples to preach His gospel. They were men, and yet in a way they were only little children; for there was much about this new Kingdom of Jesus Christ that they did not understand. Their Master knew them thoroughly. He knew their hearts, and all the difficulties that presented themselves to their minds. He argued with these difficulties, and he answered questions that His disciples had never got the length of asking. Then, in a manner, Christ was one of themselves. His home had been amongst the working people, and if opposition met those disciples anywhere He felt sure it would come from their own relatives. 'Even your fathers will turn against you,' He said, 'and a daughter will turn against her mother'—'A man's foes shall be they of his own household.' Now, most of you boys and girls gathered here in church have fathers and mothers who have begun to be anxious about you, because you are out in the world, because you are at school.

1. There, even the very first day you went, the foe met you. You boys remember that morning. You felt timid because you did not know any one. You thought a good deal about your mother. When you went into the playground you wished that you had as a friend one of those boys whom every one seemed to like. Now, at school the standard of what is called excellence in character is not very high. Ask yourselves what sort of boy is admired in the playground. If I put the question to you, I should get all sorts of answers. A strong athletic boy has a big following, and a clever one is respected, but the mere fact that a boy is good and well principled counts for little. If a boy is clever, he does not lose the respect of his class-fellows by being lazy or by scamping his work. In fact, he is often liked in proportion as he is able to make his masters believe that he does work—to 'dodge' them, as we say. Is that not so? Well, this boy and his followers will like *you* all the better if you become like them. Haven't you seen a new scholar ridiculed by the foolish boys about him, until in the end he was captured as one of their band? It was the ridicule he feared. He gave up his affections, even his conscience, to them. They were the foes in his household. Such boys would not be good friends for you to have if you were in trouble, would they? Besides, there is generally something about their company which, when you are in it, makes you forget altogether about what is serious in life. A character in one of the greatest tragedies ever written is made to say that she feared to be in the company of a certain man, because he made her feel that she could not pray.

2. What shall I say to you girls? You, of course, go to school too. But your foes are different from those of your brothers. You are not so ready to fall down and worship a classmate. Let me tell you about a very ordinary girl called Nellie. She came to school from a very simple home, but she had about her a certain ambition—a common one—to be a fine lady. Soon she noticed that a good many of the other girls shunned her, simply because her father was a working man. At first she did not mind much, but one day a class-fellow, whose parents were going abroad, came up to bid a group of girls good-bye. She shook hands with every one but Nellie. We cannot blame Nellie because she went home with a sore heart. If she had only been brave, the experience would have helped to make her a very fine woman. But it was ambition, not courage, that flamed up within her. After a time she succeeded in making friends with a girl—one who imagined herself superior to those around her at this ordinary board school, and who spoke slightingly of a family whose

mother had to eke out her income by hard work. At home Nellie had been taught the terrible evil of falsehood, and the duty of being absolutely sincere. She did not tell direct lies; but she led this foolish girl friend to believe that her family, although poor, had once been in a very different position. 'My mother was a lady,' so poor Nellie said. She was certainly a 'lady,' but not as Nellie's words implied; they were as much lies as direct untruths, and were uttered for the sake of a very silly ambition.

3. What does all this mean in the end? My boys and girls, it means that we are led away from God—that we sacrifice everything, even our souls, for fear of ridicule, or for what is a piece of utter folly. Can we not be brave? It is told of Carey the missionary that he was never ashamed of his humble origin. On one occasion, when at the Governor-General's table, he overheard an officer opposite him asking another, loud enough to be heard, whether Carey had not once been a shoemaker. 'No, sir,' exclaimed Carey immediately, 'only a cobbler!' You are called, boys and girls, to be brave, and to fight these foes of your own household. It is a real battle; but there is One who, if you will but ask His help, will never fail you. It is those who are not cowards, but who fight in earnest, that earn the 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' Think of it.

Cura Curarum.

By the Rev. A. F. Taylor, M.A., St. Cyrus.

'What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?'—Mt 16[26].

'There is a power that lies at the centre of all success in preaching and whose influence reaches out to the circumference and is essential everywhere. . . . [That] power is—the value of the human soul, felt by the preacher and inspiring all his work.'—Phillips Brooks.

'I think we are sometimes apt to let our anxiety for the salvation of souls degenerate into a mere pity for the misery into which they might be brought by sin, and the result of such a low thought is that we have been brought to believe that a soul is, as we say, 'safe'—that it has been forgiven and will not be punished, and we are satisfied. The thought of rescue has monopolized our religion and often crowded out the thought of culture. . . . The larger and deeper value of the human soul, I think, is seen in all the sermons of the greatest preachers. . . . It is a glowing vision of how great and beautiful the soul of man might be, of what great things it might do if it were thoroughly purified and possessed by the love of God and so opened free channels to His power.'—Phillips Brooks.

'There is, I am sure, in the human soul a deep consciousness which responds to him who sincerely and with the language of reality speaks to it of the great and everlasting purposes for which it was created. There are sublime instincts in man. There is in human nature a want which the world cannot supply, a thirst for objects on which to pour forth more fervent admiration of love than visible things awaken, and thirst for the unseen, the infinite, and the everlasting.'—W. E. Channing.

'In all your preaching echo the ministry of Jesus, who spoke to the lowest and most sensual people directly of the everlasting love, and by the trust He had in them brought them to His Father.'—Phillips Brooks.

'We must thoughtfully and steadily realize the spiritual capacities of the human heart. . . . I am sure that it is a very common mistake to underrate the spiritual capacity of those with whom we have to do, especially among the poor. . . . The grace of God, the light and life that flow from His indwelling, can lift the very weariest and hardest driven soul into a dignity of endurance, a radiance of faith, and simplicity of love far above all that this world can give or take away. . . . Yes, right through the constant stress of need, right through the daily hardships, and in the midst of all the storms of temptation round about them there is indeed a beauty and a joy that comes into men's homes and lives, ay, and into their very faces, when, through the revelation of His love, and the power of His sacraments, He enters into and dwells with them, to take the vacant throne of their hearts, to claim them for His own and be their God. And I think there is no beauty and no joy so well worth working for, so wonderful to see as that, and none that seems so like an earnest of the life of Heaven.

. . . Remember the height of the aim, the splendour of the hope, not simply to produce here and there some amendment in the outward look of things, but to bear, by the Holy Ghost, the love of God into the hearts of men; to help them to yield themselves to Him; to teach them to be glad with the true happiness which He designs for them; to bring the calm pure light of heaven among the troubles and sorrows and difficulties of this earth; remember that and surely it will not seem strange if for such a hope there may be need . . . of years of watchfulness and prayer and loving service.'—Phillips Brooks.

'Here is thy footstool, and there rest thy feet where live the poorest, and lowliest, and lost.

'When I try to bow to thee, my obeisance cannot reach down to the depth where thy feet rest among the poorest, and lowliest, and lost.

'Pride can never approach to where thou walkest in the clothes of the humble among the poorest, and lowliest, and lost.

'My heart can never find its way to where thou keepest company with the companionless among the poorest, the lowliest, and the lost.'—Rabindranath Tagore.

'That ye may know with all the saints what is . . . *the depth* of the love of Christ.'—Eph 3^{18}.

Chinese Sidelights upon Scripture Passages.

By the Rev. W. Arthur Cornaby, Wusueh, China.

III.

Vestiges of Paradise.—'It is said that there lingers in all races the memory of a golden time when God and man were friends.'[1] Such a memory seems to linger in the heart of a Chinese race, spite the fact that human life on earth is also represented as a slow emergence from barbarism.

For our immediate purpose it may be noted that one of the oldest books which China possesses, the *Hill and Sea Classic* (written 'probably earlier than the Chou dynasty,' founded 1122 B.C., and full of accounts of strange lands, according to the traditions of the Hsia dynasty, 2205–1767 B.C.), contains a short description of a land—far away to the West—whose inhabitants 'have a never-dying longevity,'—which passage has impressed itself deeply upon the Taoist imagination.

The commentator, Kuo P'o (276–324 A.D.), a scholar of Taoist persuasion, adds to the text words which he derives from other ancient traditions, saying: 'Upon a hill there is the no-death tree, those who eat thereof never die. There too is the ruddy (or living) fountain, those who drink thereof never grow old.' The latter words remind us that St. John idealized a similar tradition in the words (Rev 21^{6} 22^{17}) which stand over against those others concerning the 'tree of life' (Rev 2^{7} $22^{2.\,19}$). And in Kuo P'o's own writings there occurs the fine sentence: 'All things are transient, man's life is a journey, but the tree of immortality overshadows the world.'

The Fall of Man.—The question, 'Is human nature radically wrong?' has been, above all other subjects, a prominent topic of debate among Chinese philosophers. Confucius, ever averse to speculation, contented himself with the dictum, 'Man was born for uprightness.' And in his optimistic moments he declared that the life of goodness was within easy reach of any man's fully determinate desires, but toward the end of his life (according to Lieh Tzu) he spoke in another strain:

> 'I have . . . (laboured) for the righting of the world, and the guidance of posterity. But even in my native State . . . goodness and justice are more than ever decayed, and human nature more than ever attenuated. If the right Way has no followers in a single State for a single year, how will it prevail in the world at large for all generations?'

K'ung Chi, his grandson, began the classic of *The* (*Golden*) *Mean* with the words:

> '*Nature* is that which is Divinely appointed (unto man). The true *Way* is accordance with that *nature*. And it is the province of moral instruction to regulate that *Way*.'[2]

And the ambiguity of the word 'nature,' as here used, opened the long debate concerning human nature in general.

[1] Sir W. Robertson Nicoll.

[2] This utterance seems to be an echo of a sentence in the ancient *Book of Odes*: 'The majestic God (Shang Ti) has conferred upon the people a moral sense, to accord with which would give them a right and constant nature.'

Meng K'o (Mencius, 372–289 B.C.) maintained that human nature was radically right—at least in childhood. Hsun K'uang, a contemporary of his, maintained the opposite, beginning his thesis with the words:

> 'Human nature is bad. Its virtues are falsities, being born of mere self-interest';

and defended his position with the pertinacity of Thomas Hobbes—his unconscious disciple. Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.–18 A.D.), a broad-minded philosopher, adopted a middle course, of which the chief dictum was:

> 'Human nature is a confused mass of good and evil. The cultivation of good makes one a good man; the cultivation of evil, an evil man. The spirit (which one cherishes) is the steed which carries one in either direction.'

But it happened that Yang Hsiung's 'spirit' (or 'determination') led him to accept the office of statesman under 'the usurper Wang Mang' (who set aside the strict rules of imperial heredity). And so his doctrine was discredited on account of his politics—not by any means the final instance, in the world's history, of this phenomenon!

Thus the discussion continued, in the hands of ten more writers, for as many centuries longer. At length Chu Hsi (1130–1200 A.D.), the distinguished commentator of the classics, was allowed the last word. In his lectures to students he taught, with much cogent reasoning, that man's innermost nature reflected Heavenly Principle, but in practice the desires and passions indulged became a torrent which swept away all principle. Thus, in the end, we find a Chinese philosopher expressing himself somewhat on the lines of what Gn 3 so graphically portrays.

Moral failure, then, is recognized in China; its origin being an indulgence in human passion instead of obedience to Heavenly Principle. With the fading away of a personal God (once owned in the earlier centuries), the distinctive idea of *sin* as an offence against a Divine Personage (as the Hebrews regarded it) naturally faded away also. But it was once present among the Chinese, as might be shown from several passages in the *Book of Odes* and *History Classic*, and lingered in Confucius' mind so far as to draw forth the sharp rejoinder, to a frivolous question from an evil man of high position: 'He who sins against Heaven has no place for prayer' (compare 'no place of repentance,' He 12^{17}, and 'If a man sin against the Lord, who shall intreat for him?' 1 S 2^{25}).

Reading this striking utterance of Confucius we must remember that he was speaking from the point of view of a minister of justice (he had filled the offices of magistrate and chief judge for some years, with complete probity), in a land whose ancient God, the 'Sovereign Above,' had been recognized as a God of goodness for the good, and of strict justice for the evil-doer. Confucius, the ex-judge, would not have been able to understand the judicial problem presented in the Hebrew words:

> The Lord . . . forgiveth . . . iniquities . . .
> He hath not dealt with us after our sins,
> Nor rewarded us after our iniquities,

uttered of One who 'executeth righteous acts';—except under conditions of stately sacrifice, and princely mediation (to be described anon), in connexion with which the same word *sin* occurs twice again in the classics.

Origin of Religion.—In our first chapter three distinct accounts of Creation were given, the first of which may be regarded as religious, for it attributes the whole to the power of 'the Heaven-Spirit,' who is identified by the ancient commentator with the 'Lord of Heaven,'[1] and more generally with *Shang Ti* (the 'Sovereign Above' or Sovereign Supreme). The second account is semi-religious, while the third is frankly philosophical. This third account is given, after the transparent myth of P'an Ku the mason, in the Historical Records.

Turning to those Records we next find three periods passed under ruling personification of Heaven, Earth, and Man, respectively—regarded by all historians as an entirely mythical interpolation (the first period is undated, the second is given as 1800 years, and the third as 450,600 years, to the bewilderment of all serious readers). But of the last period it is recorded that

[1] The use of the non-classical term helps to fix the date of the comment. The chief monarch of the Ch'in dynasty (Shih Huang, or 'Sovereign Inaugurator,' 221–210 B.C.), wishing to break with the past, abolished the imperial worship of the 'Sovereign Above,' and set up eight 'Lords' as objects of worship, the chief of which was 'Lord of Heaven.' It was under this influence that the utterance originated, embodying the highest term then in vogue; which utterance appears as a quotation in the *Shuo Wen* dictionary of 100 A.D.

> 'All things grew and flourished, manners were pure and conditions pleasing, rulers were not emptily regal nor ministers emptily noble; rule and religion arose spontaneously, together with (the preparation of) food and the (right relations of the) sexes.'

Truly a golden age! But just as the Book of Genesis opens with two accounts of human origins, the one ideal, the other (2^{4}-3^{24}) pictorially accounting for facts as we find them, so in these Records we find next a strikingly different narrative—not of a Fall, however, but of a gradual emergence from abject barbarism.

> 'At the very beginning, men dwelt in caves of the wilderness, on terms of close familiarity with the brutes, with no sense of revulsion. But as men grew in wisdom and artifice, then enmity began: the beasts developed claws and teeth, horns and poison (as snakes), till men could scarcely overcome them. . . . At that time men had no idea of husbandry, but fed on the produce of herbs and trees; they knew not the use of fire, but drank the blood of beasts and ate their flesh, using their skins to cover themselves, first in front and then behind.'

Then an Instructor appeared, who 'framed dwellings of tree-boughs, and taught men to dwell therein for protection from the wild beasts.' Anon, a second Instructor arose, who 'produced fire from the friction of pieces of wood, and taught the art of cookery.' And later,

> 'He erected a pulpit for the propagation of religion.'

The commentator adds that this was 'the origin of religion,' and seeking to know what is meant by that term, we read on further.

There follows another description of primitive man, as though from a separate document—concerning the 'reign' of a third Instructor:

> 'At the beginning of human existence men were no different from birds and beasts. They recognized a mother, but not a father; they felt mutual likings, but knew not the proprieties of marriage . . . till Fu Hsi (the third Instructor) inaugurated that institution, and the giving of marriage-tokens. He regulated surnames, the system of match-making by deputy, and the betrothal covenant, thus giving weight to the essentials of human relations.'

This gives us a partial answer to our query, for the Chinese word that is so often translated 'religion' is literally 'moral admonition'[1]; and morality in Confucius' teaching means 'the right fulfilment of human relations.' But we read on further, for fuller light.

After the 'reign' of a fourth Instructor—who teaches husbandry and medicine—we emerge from the section of general anthropology, and find portrayed the first well-defined ruler of 'the black haired race'—or 'hundred families.' His honorific title is Huang Ti (Yellow Sovereign)—'yellow' from the dust of the earth (according to Taoists); his 'palace' was in the Kuen-lun mountain district in Central Asia (according to a work of the second or third century B.C., when its site was visited and identified), and the date given, by cycle reckoning, is 2697–2598 B.C.—a full hundred years for his reign. And as a further hint of his Western origin, he is said in the Records to have gained the services of a certain T'sang Chieh, anciently pronounced Tung Ki (the characters of the name are meaningless), whom Professor de Lacouperie identifies with the Chaldean patron of literature Dung-gi, for the invention of writing.[2]

Before this ruler gained his supremacy there was strife among the clans, the various 'nobles' were in revolt. He attacked them with halberds and shields, and they gave him their allegiance. But on his claiming their lands, they revolted again. He then went forth in his chariot, captured and slew the leader of the revolt, and was acknowledged as 'ordained of Heaven' to be 'Son of Heaven' or earthly deputy of the Divine.

[1] It is formed of the two signs *filial* and *to beat*, i.e. *admonition in filial duty* as being the chief moral relation of life, and thus *moral instruction* in general. It is undoubtedly used for 'religion' in connexion with the early patriarchal religion of China, though solely as 'moral instruction' in connexion with the teaching of Confucius—concerning which modern primers in English for Chinese Government schools affirm: 'Confucianism was never a religion, but a system of morality.' Since 1900 a prefix answering to *hiero-* has been added, in literature and journalism, to make it fully 'religion.'

[2] As the invention of writing had been already attributed to Fu Hsi, the third Instructor, in these Records, the Chinese commentators are completely bewildered with this second, strangely-named, personage.

Accordingly, after appointing various officers, and inaugurating a bureau of astronomy (whose results happen to coincide with those of ancient Chaldea):

> 'He erected a palatial hall, wherein he offered sacrificial worship to the Sovereign Above, having called together the whole populace and instructed them in rule and religion.'

Inquiring still further what is meant by 'sacrificial worship to the Sovereign Above,' we find the following explanation, preserved in a memorial to the throne by a statesman, Hu Hung, of the twelfth century A.D.:

> 'The sovereign serves Heaven as Father. He must do so with settled sincerity and refined unity of virtue. He selects a spot of land to the south of the capital, prepares the ground, and sacrifices to the Vast Heavenly Sovereign Above: the word *Heavenly* denoting his disposition, and the word *Sovereign* his essential nature.'

And the ancient invocation associated with such worship is preserved for us by Confucius, in the words of the chieftain (afterwards sovereign) T'ang the Completer (r. 1766–1754 B.C.):

> 'I, the little child . . . (giving his child-name), presume to use a dark coloured ox, and presume to announce to (Thee, O) most great and imperial Sovereign, that . . . (here follows the special event on which Divine approval is asked); if in my person I sin, that sin is not to rest on the populace of the land: but if the people commit sin, that sin must rest on my own person.'

Such was the 'stately sacrifice and princely mediation' quoted above, for 'sin against Heaven,' as recognized by Confucius.

Arabic Christian Literature.

By Margaret D. Gibson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Cambridge.

II.

We come now to the most interesting of all the poets of this period, *Adi bin Zaid*, b. about A.D. 480, d. 578. His family was of village origin, from the district of Yemāmeh, but one of his ancestors had, in consequence of manslaughter, removed to Al-Ḥira, a kingdom dependent on the Persian monarchy. The son of this ancestor was in revenge killed by one of his father's tribe, and his son Hammād, having got into a scuffle one day, was kept at home by his mother, and taught the art of writing with such success that Al-Numān, king of Al-Ḥira, made him the royal secretary. After his death the talent of his son Zaid was recognized by a powerful noble, who caused him to be taught Persian, and recommended him to Chosroes Anoushirwān for the courier service, to which only the sons of nobles had been hitherto appointed. 'Adi, his son, was born in the year 480. Zaid continued to preside over the Persian courier service during the reigns of several kings of Al-Ḥira in succession; Nu'mān III. making a boon-companion of the young 'Adi, who to his literary gifts added an astonishing dexterity in archery and Persian games of skill. The king was an idolater. One day as he and 'Adi were out hunting, they went under the shade of a lovely tree. 'What does this tree say?' asked the poet. 'I do not know,' replied the king. 'Adi improvised thus:

> Let the man whom we see reason thus with his soul,
> That soon o'er his life-course the sunset shall creep;
> Time's foot will not wait while he walks to that goal,
> And far in the depths of the hills he shall sleep.
>
> Perhaps round about us a troop may encamp,
> To quaff the pure water with wine by the way;
> While their goblets shall rattle with lids as they tramp
> On the finest of steeds in a gaudy array.
>
> They lived all their life on the best of the wheat;
> But their thread shall be cut with a leisurely knife;
> Time blows like a wind, and they fall from their feet,
> And this is the story of life after life.

They next passed a cemetery, whose language the poet thus expounded:

> O riders who gallop so merrily by,
> Like you we have been, and like us ye shall lie.

'And is there any escape?' said the king. 'Yes,' replied the poet, 'that you leave off the worship of idols, and serve God alone.' So the king became a Christian.

Whether this story be fact or fiction, it is certain that several kings of the dynasty professed the Christian religion, and that their doing so had serious political consequences, as it weakened their allegiance to Persia, and gradually led to their becoming the allies of the Byzantine Emperors in the long struggle between the empires of the Cæsars and the Chosroes. The type of Christianity adopted by king Nu'mān unfortunately suggested to him the idea of abandoning his kingdom, and becoming a pilgrim. The people of Al-Ḥira requiring another ruler in such circumstances, Chosroes appointed Zaid regent, a post which he filled till the death of that monarch, whose son Hormuz sent 'Adi on an embassy to the Greek Emperor Tiberius. The poet also visited Damascus, and there recited poetry in praise of wine. His father's regency at Al-Ḥira appears to have been intermittent, for we learn that afterwards, on the rule of their lawful sovereign, Al-Mundhir, becoming so atrocious that his subjects sought to kill him, he sent to Zaid asking him to undertake the government in his stead. The people saluted Zaid as king, but he declined the title, and ruled them with the consent of their lawful sovereign, being a king in all but the name, whence his son wrote:

O brethren, ye know that before you we went
As props of the house and as staves of the tent.

'Adi married Hind, daughter of one Al-Nu'mān, it is hard to say which. He fell in love with her in the church of St. Thomas in Al-Ḥira, where he had gone in great state to offer presents from Chosroes. Al-Mundhir had ten sons, praised by the poet Al-A'sha for their beauty. Chosroes sent for them after their father's death, that he might choose the one who appeared fittest to rule. 'Adi's good counsel to Nu'mān, the eldest, gained for him the throne of his ancestors. Ere long, while 'Adi was on a visit to Al-Ḥira, the ungrateful prince listened to the poet's detractors and put him into a prison, from which he never emerged. Whilst there he wrote many verses, from which we select the following:

Nu'mān, O thou king whom I set on the throne,
How long wilt thou leave me in prison to moan?
My throat it is needless to moisten and coax,
I am like to a man who with water-gulps chokes.
My foes are rejoicing that far from their sight
Their malice has chained me in sorrowful plight;
For even though Time brought abundance of wealth,
It has turned to disaster, and never to health;
And if with some wisdom my days have been spent,
The life of a man is a thing that is lent.
The finest brocade may be rope to a pail,
And water the cliffs that no ladders can scale.
Each note of my song had been truthful and right,
When last I distinguished the day from the night.
From the stain of a crime all my record is clear,
Though its pages are closed in misfortune and fear.
My soul must sit still and commune with her grief,
My prison's stern silence her only relief.
O brethren, ye know that before you we went
As props of the house and as staves of the tent;
Your father was never a man to agree
To a day of such bitter injustice to me;
For the sake of the past may the Lord send His grace,
From you and from yours came my splendour of place;
May God show you His mercy, and soften your fate,
Beyond what all wearers of girdles relate.

By the time that the poet had communicated with his brother Ubey, who, like himself, was in high favour at the Persian court, and Chosroes had sent a messenger to Al-Ḥira to demand the prisoner's release, the latter had just been suffocated by his enemies. Al-Nu'mān repented having allowed this murder.

Quss bin Sâ'ida, Bishop of Najrān, d. A.D. 600, a celebrated poet and preacher, must in one capacity or the other have powerfully influenced his countrymen, as they fondly imagined that he had lived for six or seven hundred years, and had known the Apostles in his youth. Unfortunately very little of the verse which he used to recite from a gallery in the market-place of 'Okāẓ has been preserved, but we may take the following as a specimen:

The men who live will soon be dead,
And all the dead have ceased to be;
Whatever is to come will come;
The pitch-black night on angry sea,
Or sky engemmed with radiant stars;
The light, the dark; the just, the knave;
The food and drink for daily need;
The dress, the horse with trappings brave.
Alas! I see the people go,
But never one return again.
Can man abide though much he would?
Or can he sleep if he were fain?
I vow by Quss bin Sâ'ida's Lord,
There is not on this world's broad face
A better thing for Man than Faith.
Thrice blest is he who gains this grace,
And follows it through all his days;
But woe to him who seeks to raise
Rebellion 'gainst his Maker's ways.

Ḥātim at Ṭaiy, who died in A.D. 605, and whose real name was *Khuzaimeh*, is chiefly noted for his extreme liberality in succouring the distressed, and his lavish hospitality. It is related that the reigning Cæsar, in order to try the poet's generosity, once sent a messenger to Ḥātim to request the gift of a valuable horse which the latter possessed. The imperial chamberlain arrived *incognito*, at a time when all Ḥātim's animals were out at pasture, with the result that, when at length the monarch's request was announced, the poet had to confess that in order to entertain the unexpected stranger he had slaughtered the very animal wanted. When the nights were cold, Ḥātim ordered a slave to light a fire on the top of a neighbouring hill to guide wayfarers to his door.

Let thy fire be a beacon when cold is the night,
And the wind blows like knives o'er the wandering wight;
Should his eyes see its rays, should they gladden his heart,
Should he ride to my house, then a freeman thou art.

In Syria at the present day, it is a common way of expressing gratitude to exclaim, 'Thou must be Ḥātim et-Ṭaiy!'

Umeiyah bin Abi 's-Ṣalt, d. 624, is considered by the Arabs as a poet of the first rank. The quality of his Christianity may be judged from the following lines:

As the rose that springs up from the ground
Diffuses sweet fragrance around,
Deep-tinged is thy sword with the stain
From the blood of the foes thou hast slain.

On his death-bed, however, he expressed more edifying sentiments:

Though long and slow our days be passed,
Though foot of Time be never fast,
The end of life must come at last.

He has been credited with having dictated some verses of the Corân.

Maimūn bin Queis, or *Al-A'sha* = the half-blind, d. A.D. 629, was called 'the cymbal-player of the Arabs.' He was of noble parentage, and had a cultivated mind. His family sold wine, and he went every year for this purpose to the market at Mecca. During his visits to Al-Ḥira to replenish his stock, he was instructed by the Christians of that place. He excelled both in encomiums and in satire, and seems to have had, like Burns, a faculty for throwing out a shaft of either kind effectively. In contrast to the great Scottish bard, however, we are sorry to say, Al-A'sha degraded his muse by flattering the powerful chiefs of his time for the sake of receiving rich presents. It was well worth their while to secure his friendship, for his powers were such that he was even known by their employment to get hitherto unmarriageable girls wedded in such a manner as to enrich their parents.

His contemporary Lebid, holding views which are now called Calvinist, having written:

The man that is guided by Allah shall walk in the fairest of ways;
His heart shall rejoice, whilst for others God wills that they grope in a maze.

Al-'Asha, who held to the Arminian view, replied:

Alike in our rest and our journey, though long the delays that we find,
God calls us to life and to justice, and He metes out His blame to mankind.
Our songs are the jewels of life, and our deeds leave their traces behind.

Al-A'sha's wanderings brought him into contact with the Prophet, to whom he offered a present of valuable camels. His lines to Muhammad, beginning with the question, 'Doth thine eye ever sleep?' though meant for an encomium, have a tendency to slip into satire:

If thou goest into Sheol with no store of gracious doing,
And meetest there a man who has sought his neighbour's weal,
That thou art not like thy comrade perchance thou wilt be rueing,
And the shortness of thy vision acutely thou wilt feel.
Alas for thee! dead women will not hasten to embrace thee,
The iron arrow from thy hand will never reach its goal;
No pilgrim broken by fatigue will again be forced to face thee,
And vow with thee to worship God, or let idols rule his soul;
No well-conditioned Houri of all thine earthly bevy
Within the realm of Sheol will own thee for her spouse;
To cousins and to kinsmen let no punishment be heavy,
Nor even to the hapless slave led captive to thy house.
With prayers at morn and evening be thou for ever ready;
Address them not to Iblis, but only to thy Lord;
From no one in dire poverty thy taxes must thou levy,
Nor think that all the goods of Time for Eternity are stored.

On account of some subsequent satirical verses, a party of the Ḳoreish, fearing the effect they might have on the Arabs, waylaid Al-A'sha and killed him. It became a custom for young men to drink and gamble on his grave, regarding him still, though dead, as their boon companion. One of

his odes is included by some in the Mo'allaḳāt, or seven poems hung up in the Ka'ba at Mecca.

Harmala bin Al-mundhir, known as *Abou Zubaid* (?) flourished at the court of a king of Persia. He died in A.D. 640.

'Umeer bin Shueem, known as *Al Qatāmy*, who died in A.D. 710, was sharp-sighted enough to write eulogies on the king of Damascus and other princes, receiving rich presents as reward.

The same may be said of Ghiāth bin Ghauth, d. A.D. 712, who was early nicknamed *Al-Achṭal*, the Chatterer, by one of the victims of his satire. He was highly honoured by the Caliph Abd-al-Mâlik and considered the greatest of Arab poets. He wore costly robes, etc., as a Laureate should; yet it is related that a friend found him under ecclesiastical censure, undergoing imprisonment in a church in Damascus for the crime of lampooning respectable women. The visitor having persuaded the priest to release the poet, after scolding him and obtaining a promise of repentance, inquired of Al-Achṭal why he, so much honoured by the Caliph, should have submitted to so much indignity at the hands of one distinctly his inferior, and received for answer, *ed deen*, *ed deen*, 'Religion!'

Al-Achṭal's wit was most incisive. On one occasion, being annoyed by an unwelcome intruder, he wrote:

> If a Spark should drop into my cup,
> I skim it most skilfully up;
> If a Fly come my nectar to sip,
> I spurn it with tongue and with lip;
> But what can I do with a Bore,
> Who comes without leave through my door?

On another occasion, he and a friend having put away their wives, and Al-Achṭal having married his friend's wife, he reported the result as follows:

> When torn by divorces each other we wed,
> Our wounds were all raw, and were chafed by our bed;
> I mourned my lost wife, whilst my partner in ruth
> Wailed loudly and long for the spouse of her youth.

Literature.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

The change in our attitude to the Old Testament which has been made in a single generation may be seen by any one who reads the volume on *The Religion of Israel* which has been written by Professor Henry Preserved Smith of New York, and has been published in this country by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (8s. net). A generation ago we were judged by the Old Testament, now the Old Testament is judged by us. That is perhaps the best way of stating the difference.

Professor Smith is by no means so advanced as to be out of sight of Old Testament students in general. His book is almost a surprise of conservatism. But there is no mistake about his attitude. Sometimes it is the institutions that he transforms, sometimes the theology. 'Earlier writers than Ezekiel placed the ideal age of Israel in the past and the wilderness journey was a triumph of godliness; Ezekiel transferred the ideal age into the Future and made Israel guilty of gross disobedience in the wilderness.' Again, there is nothing in the Old Testament of what we mean by Atonement. 'In the sin-offering and guilt-offering there is no idea of expiation in the sense in which the word is ordinarily understood—that is, the victim was not a substitute, giving his life for the life of the guilty man. The emphasis laid upon the blood, which is often interpreted as favouring the theory of substitution, is due to quite another consideration. By ancient tradition blood is sacred, either because it is the blood of an animal dedicated to the divinity, and so partakes of his sanctity, or else because this mysterious fluid, containing the life of the animal, has in it intrinsically something supernatural.'

The book is admirably written. We have said there is no doubt of Dr. Smith's attitude. There is no doubt of anything. His mind and his language are both clear as running water. And he is never irreverent. On the contrary, so reverent towards the truth is he that he states it simply and unaffectedly, however strange it may appear to us.

VENOSTA.

A translation into English of Giovanni Visconti Venosta's *Memoirs of Youth* has been made by Mr. William Prall (Constable; 12s. 6d. net). The dis-

tinguished author tells what he saw and knew of the things which happened to Italy, and most minutely of the things which happened to his beloved city of Milan, between the years 1847 and 1860. The story has often been told, but it will stand more telling yet. Venosta is not a professional historian, but he does not lack imagination, and he has an excellent memory. The story as told by him loses none of its charm. And in some particulars it is quite new, at least in the impression made upon the reader.

He stands curiously apart from the great actors, although he himself had his place in some of the great acts they did. To Mazzini he is almost cold, not to say contemptuous. And even with Garibaldi he is as one who looks on with interest rather than as one who takes his place by his side. Of Cavour alone does he speak always with admiration and with affection. The enthusiasm of the Italian people for Garibaldi he cannot yet understand. He says:

'On the heels of the Cacciatori degli Appennini there came squads of volunteers, sent from all parts of Lombardy, to join the corps of Garibaldi. They were men of all sorts and conditions, and of every age: often miserable in appearance, and they generally looked fatigued. Old men, and even children, followed oftentimes for a month or so the Garibaldian troops. They were gathered up in the stations and sifted out. A large number were sent home. One of the characteristic spectacles of the day was the enthusiasm that animated people along Garibaldi's track, as if they were caught up by a whirlwind. The fascination that he exerted upon the multitude was marvellous, and now seems incredible. When he traversed a district (although he did not yet wear his red shirt), it did not seem that it was a general that passed, but rather the head of a new religion. The women were not less moved than the men. They often carried their babes to him that he should bless, or even baptize, them.

'To the crowds who gathered about him Garibaldi would address a few words in the marvellous voice which was part of his fascination: "Turn every one of you your scythe into a weapon," he would say at the crossroads and public places, "and come. He who remains at home is vile. I do not promise you anything but toil and fatigue and fusillades; but we will conquer or die."'

Yet Venosta himself supplies the explanation. A little later he tells us something of Garibaldi's way with the recruits. 'The General came on the 8th of July, and Guicciardi immediately took him to see the volunteers, who were not housed, but sheltered, in some old churches and magazines, and shops, and other habitations. Some of them were so miserable they could not go out. Garibaldi took several hours to pass them in review. Arranged in files they presented a comic spectacle. They were lads with workmen's or students' caps, workmen in shirt-sleeves, old men with beards, and dandies in stylish town clothes. There were short and tall, stout and thin, men, like the pipes of an organ. Garibaldi looked at them kindly, since at the bottom of his heart he had a great predilection for the citizen soldiers, as they represented the revolution. He examined them all in order to assign the able-bodied to the proper corps. He asked Guicciardi (not, perhaps, without some regret) to request the furnishers to provide military clothing for the necessitous.'

THE ILLUSTRATED MACAULAY.

Messrs. Macmillan have published the fourth volume of *The History of England* by Lord Macaulay, as edited by Professor C. H. Firth, M.A., and illustrated (10s. 6d. net).

The volume ends with the War in Ireland. And now that things have settled themselves there, or have been settled for us by the act of the Emperor of Germany, we can read Macaulay's story of the War in Ireland as we never could read it before. This is one of the gifts that have just been given us. Unity, loyalty, men to fight and women to weep—these are among the gifts; and this also that the history of Ireland, with all the wrong and all the shame, can be read by us as it ought to be read. The pity of it is felt as surely in Macaulay as anywhere else, for if he is rhetorical overmuch he relates the particulars, and it is only too easy to see how bitter the misery is and how pathetic the despair behind his well-polished sentences, his artfully chosen words.

Well, this is now the edition, and only this, in which to read Macaulay. The illustrations illustrate everything and everybody. Seven of them are in colour, quite equal to the finest of the finely coloured illustrations in works of fine art. Then the page is so generous and the printing so fair. Messrs. Macmillan have produced great editions of

others of their great authors; they have done nothing better than this.

DANTE AND THE EARLY ASTRONOMERS.

'We shall never understand all that the skies meant to him unless we realize that a general belief in their influence on man was deeply rooted in his mind. For him it was a tremendous fact, and one which pervades his writings, that stars and spheres are the instruments of God's providence, and are ordained by the First Mover to mould the destinies of Earth. It is their movements which manifest His Will; they are the hammers, earth the metal, they are the seals, and earth the wax.

'Three times the stars are invoked to bring justice and righteousness on earth. Through the spheres the elements were evolved out of the first chaotic matter, and everything on earth took form; all life and motion is generated by them. Man's soul is a direct creation by God, but the moving heavens play an important part in the formation of his material body, his mental faculties, and his disposition. Were it not for the action of the spheres, children would be precisely like their parents, their whole nature being governed by the law of heredity alone: it is the different influences of the skies that give them different natures. This, says Beatrice, is perhaps what Plato meant when he said that souls came from different stars and returned thither: if his meaning was that the influences of the stars is so great that to them is due the praise or blame which we distribute to men, there is some truth in the saying.

'Some truth only—"alcun vero"; for the stars are not independent powers, for good or evil, which men are unable to resist. This view is expressly combated in *Purg.* xvi. 58–84. Dante has asked the spirit of the courtly Venetian Marco Lombardo why the world is so full of wickedness now, for some say it is the effect of the heavens, and others seek an earthly cause. Marco groans at the blindness of men, who accuse heaven for the results of their own misdeeds: it is true that the heavens influence our lower natures, our instincts, and desires; but the soul is free, and can control them. This is in accordance with the teaching of St. Augustine and Aquinas. In one passage of the *De Monarchia*, Dante goes even further than this, and asserts that the influences of the spheres are only good, and that evil results from imperfections in the material on which these perfect instruments work.

'Conceptions such as these give us a new idea of mediæval astrology. They may be mistaken, but at least they are grand, and not unworthy of a philosopher and a Christian.'

For this reason the study of the astronomy of Dante is of much interest, not only to Dante students, but also to religious teachers and to every ordinarily educated reader. And the best book by far in which to study the subject has just been written, at the Kodaikanal Observatory in Southern India, by M. A. Orr (Mrs. John Evershed), and published in this country by Messrs. Gall & Inglis (15s. net). It is a handsome volume of over five hundred octavo pages; its value, moreover, is increased by several plate and text engravings. With all Mrs. Evershed's learning, the writing is charmingly simple, and while the Italian text is quoted, as is most meet, a good translation is always added in a footnote, so that that vast crowd of English people who cannot or will not learn languages may still enjoy the reading of this truly fascinating volume.

The new number of the *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* contains several papers that are of permanent value, especially one on 'Dutch Dissenters and English General Baptists,' by Sir William J. Collins, and one on Robert Cooche's 'Confutation of the Errors of the Careless by Necessity' (Bap. Union Pub. Dept.; 2s. 6d. net).

For whom has the Rev. James Baikie, F.R.A.S., written his book on the *Lands and Peoples of the Bible* (A. & C. Black; 3s. 6d. net)? It is scholarly enough for the scholar; but it is also popular enough for the people. The lands that are mentioned in the Bible, as well as the nations that inhabited them, are described in accordance with all the available material, up to the latest speculation or spadeful; the writer for the dictionaries and magazines must have the book at his hand. But then the writing is so good in style, and the illustrating is so good in art, that it is impossible to distinguish the book from those books that are published just to pass an idle evening.

A popular illustrated Report of the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1913–1914

has been issued, under the title of *In the Vulgar Tongue* (Bible House).

The Rev. D. H. S. Cranage, Litt.D., is the Secretary of the Cambridge University Local Lectures. In that position it is his occasional privilege to preach a sermon to the best audience preacher ever had. And five of the sermons preached to the students who attend the summer meetings held in connexion with the Extension Lectures of the University of Cambridge have been published in a volume entitled *Summer Meeting Sermons* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 1s. 6d. net).

Is there any book to be published this season that is likely to exceed in interest a small quarto called *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns*, which has been published at the Cambridge University Press (10s. 6d. net)? A few years ago Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis bought a palimpsest which contained in its upper script a series of homilies in Arabic by early Christian Fathers. The underscript, brought up with great care by means of hydro-sulphide of ammonia, contained a text of the *Protevangelium Jacobi* and of the *Transitus Mariae* in two columns of Estrangelo Syriac, and was published in 1902 as No. xi. *Studia Sinaitica*. But the underscript contained also six quires of Arabic; and these six quires of Arabic are of more value than all the rest.

For it has been shown by that distinguished Arabic scholar, Dr. A. Mingana, that they contain a portion of the Qurân in a text which differs from the only text hitherto known to exist. After Muhammad's death Othmân caused one copy of all the Sūrahs to be made, and the rest to be utterly destroyed, so that there has been one text, and one text only, in existence. But some owner of a few Sūrahs, using pumice-stone perhaps on his precious piece of vellum and thinking that he had rubbed the writing out, sold the vellum to a Christian. The writing was not wholly rubbed out. It has been restored, printed, and published with an enlightening introduction, by Mrs. Lewis and Dr. Mingana, and is, in the hands of students, the only portion of a pre-Othmânic text known to exist in the world.

When an author has made a hit with one book he is often tempted to try another, and miss. The Rev. R. H. Coats, B.D., made a palpable hit with his *Types of English Piety*. Now he has handled a larger subject in a smaller volume, thereby running great risks of failure. But *The Christian Life* (T. & T. Clark; 6d. net), a primer in size, will soon outstrip in circulation its elder and bigger brother. On the face of it the little book seems made for study, and probably that is its first intention. But, close packed as are its pages, and clearly divided into sections, the writing has been so well done that it may be read easily and with utmost enjoyment by those who have passed the examination stage.

In his book on *The Parabolic Gospel* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net), some chapters of which appeared in The Expository Times, the Rev. R. M. Lithgow does not expound the parables separately. His object is to show that they are connected the one with the other, and in such a way that not only do we understand better the lesson of each parable when it is set in its proper sequence and synthesis, but, more than that, we understand better the development of the teaching of our Lord. In an interesting preface Mr. Lithgow recalls the efforts that have been made by expositors in the past to group the parables in some intelligible and fruitful way. These efforts have rarely had any acceptance. Mr. Lithgow has studied the subject more than any expositor we know of, his plan is more ambitious, and his success is more assured. But whether we accept his grouping or not, we are bound to admit that by means of it he has thrown new light on more than one of the parables, and especially brought out their central and controlling teaching.

Mr. C. W. Valentine, M.A.(Cantab.), B.A.(Lond.), D.Phil.(St. And.), has written *An Introduction to Experimental Psychology* in relation to Education (Clive; 2s. 6d.). And it *is* an introduction. Nothing is done to spare the pupil the necessary discipline; everything is done to make the discipline effective and to lead on to a working knowledge of the subject. It is also up to date. For even experimental psychology is making such progress that last year's lectures are useless for this session's work. Especially is the book strong in its diagrammatic work, the diagrams, though few being just right.

A Primer of Library Practice being sold out, its

authors, Mr. G. E. Roebuck and Mr. W. B. Thorne, have rewritten it, the progress in the management of libraries in ten years having made a new book necessary. It is now published by Messrs. Grafton (2s. 6d. net). The authors' chief object is to get the public to take more interest in libraries; but the value of their book is to the librarian. They tell library managers that the best way to select new books is to read the literary reviews in all kinds of publications. They also tell librarians, and those who would like to be librarians, that the salaries of head librarians range from £800 to £80 a year, and that assistants usually get about the half of that.

Mr. Francis G. Burgess, M.A., has written a history of the Church of Christ for boys and girls, calling his book *The Story of the Kingdom* (Griffiths; 3s. 6d. net). He begins with the birth of Christ, and ends with the settlement of the Puritans in New England. At the conclusion of every chapter there is a list of questions for examination. This seems to say that the book is meant to be used at school; but it is so written that we think it will be read sometimes even in the holidays.

Pandit Shyama Shankar has written a book on *Buddha and his Sayings* (Griffiths; 3s. net). Turn to the subject of Prayer. For of all the religions of the world Buddhism (ancient Buddhism) alone makes nothing of Prayer. This is Pandit Shankar's apology: 'The gap of prayers in Buddha's system is filled in by *Karma* and the reliance on one's own *Karma*. The solace of confidence in an external help or power is supplied in his religion by confidence in internal help or power, the strength of individual action. All the higher religions of India look to the aid and light of the internal self, the depths of which are stirred up by earnest prayers or intense concentration. According to these systems the *Divine* power is both *in* and *out*. Buddha takes the inner power—a power that is within the sphere of perception and control, and names it the power of *Karma*—for this power can only be exercised by our own action or earnest application. He dispenses with the *outer* power because of its uncertainty or unnecessity. His contemplation is a sort of *yoga*, which is the invocation or cultivation of internal power. Besides, his *Karma* is in a sense prayer: *Laborare est orare* (work is prayer).'

Most students of Scripture have become familiar with the little fat blue-books called 'Bible Notes,' which are reprinted from *The British Friend*. Now that *The British Friend* is no more, will the notes be discontinued? We hope not. Those for 1913 were contributed by Mr. Herbert G. Wood, M.A., the subject being *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (Headley Brothers; 1s. net). There is nothing so good as this for study after Professor Hogg's famous book.

'If this war had happened twenty-five or thirty years ago I should have expected to see a great demand for religious and devotional literature after it ended. As it is—well, I don't know. It is much too early to speculate about such matters, in any event.' So says an American publisher in the *New York Evening Post*. His wise words are quoted in the *Publishers' Circular*. But the editor of that cleverly edited weekly just quotes them and says nothing. Their wisdom lies in 'I don't know.' The truth is that religious and devotional books are (in this country at least) in greater demand than they were twenty-five or thirty years ago. And although the outbreak of the war has disarranged things a little, we shall not have to wait to the end of it to see a good recovery. For it is frivolity and secularism that are the enemy of religion and religious literature, and already the signs are abundant of a sense of spiritual need and of moral responsibility which the war itself has brought.

It is therefore no surprise to receive from Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, even so early as this, twelve volumes of those reprints of theological and devotional books which they call the 'Expositor's Library' (2s. net each). The twelve volumes are *The Laws of Christ for Common Life*, by Dr. R. W. Dale; *The Mind of Christ in St. Paul*, by the Rev. J. G. Greenhough, M.A.; *The Burning Bush*, by the Right Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter; *The Faith of a Modern Christian*, by Professor James Orr; *Veni Creator*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule; *Verbum Crucis*, by Archbishop W. Alexander; *Following on to know the Lord*, by Archdeacon Wilberforce; *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*, by Principal P. T. Forsyth; *Miracles and Christianity*, by Professor Wendland; *The Religion of the Son of Man*, by Dr. E. J. Gough; *Christ and Man*, by Principal Marcus Dods; and *Christus Crucifixus*, by Canon J. G. Simpson.

What is meant by prayer 'in the name' of Christ? Dr. J. W. Thirtle explains in a booklet called *In the Name* (Holness; 1s. net). The chief thing is that 'at the back of the Name there is a covenant, a Divine undertaking which can never be set aside.'

Mr. E. E. Kellett, M.A., The Leys, Cambridge, is one of the small band of Teutonic scholars in this country. He has written a volume on *The Religion of our Northern Ancestors*, as one of the 'Manuals for Christian Thinkers' (Kelly; 1s. net). Professor Sayce, in a letter to *The Times*, denies that the Teutons were ancestors of ours in more than an infinitesimal degree. Even Mr. Kellett does not allow them more than a share in our ancestry—and he wrote before the war.

Another volume of the series is on *The Canon of the New Testament*, by Mr. G. W. Polkinghorne (1s. net).

'This series of books is issued by a group of friends who meet at intervals for fellowship in thought and prayer. They are united by a common aim and by a common outlook upon life, but, as is natural, with respect to detailed application of principles the conclusions of each writer will not always represent those of the entire group.

'The volumes may be few or many. Additions to the series will be furnished only as points of view are gained which, it is thought, may prove suggestive in the light of present-day difficulties and opportunities.'

'Such is the prospectus of a new series of books to be called 'The Fellowship Library,' and such is the preface to the first volume which is called *The Methodist* (Kelly; 1s. 6d. net), of which the author is the Rev. Henry Carter. The Methodist is a disciple. He is a disciple of Christ. He is also a disciple of John Wesley, but only inasmuch as John Wesley adopts the attitude of St. Paul, 'Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.' So it is 'a study in discipleship.' It expresses the ideal for the follower of Wesley who was the follower of Christ; and it is careful, with all loyalty to Methodism, not to let even Wesley get in the way and hinder the direct approach.

Epictetus and the New Testament is the title of a book in which the Rev. Douglas S. Sharp, M.A., B.D., compares the language of Epictetus, both its components and its structure, with that of the New Testament (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net). We receive it gratefully, thanking the author for the time and scholarship he has given to it, and the publisher for the beauty of the printing and the moderateness of the price. That there are many students of the New Testament who are at work on the Greek language of it has been proved by the great success of Dr. Moulton's 'Prolegomena.' May this valuable work also find the appreciation it deserves.

'The pendulum of Christian opinion and practice is continually swinging between the application of religion to this world and to the next. In one age those aspects of faith that bear upon our eternal destiny are emphasized. In the next, religion is applied to social reform and to the practical needs of this life. To-day, men will be thinking of heaven. To-morrow, they will be grappling with the problems of earth.'

It is the problems of earth that men are grappling with at the present time. To that side the pendulum has swung somewhat violently—so violently and so far that Mr. A. Gordon James has written a book on *Jesus and the Otherworld* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net) in order to bring the modern back again. It is time that the Otherworld had its innings. But the pendulum never swings back just to its old position; as it swings it advances (if that can be said of pendulums). To Mr. James the Otherworld is not simply the Heaven and Hell of the last generation. 'It may be held to include all that which is opposed to the secularism of our time. It indicates the spiritual, the unseen, the powers of the Kingdom of God.'

In pursuit of his study of Church History the Rev. William Ernest Beet, D.Lit., has now issued the volume on *The Medieval Papacy* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). Like the previously published volumes on *The Early Roman Episcopate* and *The Rise of the Papacy*, it is distinguished for the successful way in which the author writes both accurately and popularly. We do not know what books he has read (only a few are named in the the footnotes), but we could guess. They are the very best. No exploded story is repeated here. The very estimates of character are after the latest and best judgments. Take the character-sketch of Wolsey. Here is one sentence of it: 'It must be

admitted that the political genius of Cardinal Wolsey was of the very highest order, and in this respect he stands almost alone among English statesmen; while, so far from being "the minion of a foreign despotism," he succeeded in raising England, then a mere third-rate power, to a higher place in the society of nations than she had any right to expect, but which, since his day, she has never ceased to claim as her right.'

It is part of Dr. Beet's deliberate plan to hide his learning, but those who enjoy the mere reading of the book may depend upon it that they have the truth as nearly as we can at present compass it.

Messrs. Longmans have issued *Thoughts for Teachers of the Bible*, by Dean Armitage Robinson (6d. net). Its contents are: (1) The Bible as a whole; (2) Central Teachings of the New Testament; (3) The Christ of History.

Messrs. Longmans have also published an *Index to the Works of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (6s. net). It is a most satisfactory index. The compiler is the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J., B.Sc. (Oxon.). Mr. Rickaby has mastered the difficult art of making an index, and he has made this one as if it were meant to be a model for all indexes that should afterwards be made. The printing is as exemplary as the compiling.

Francesco Berger, the Composer, has published a volume of *Reminiscences, Impressions, and Anecdotes* (Sampson Low; 4s. 6d. net). The title is well chosen. Any of its three words could have been put first, any last, and any in the middle. Of all the miscellany—and it is all lively as an after-dinner speech — the most entertaining part is entitled 'Some Musical Celebrities I have known.' It gives one an idea of the range of Berger's friendships, for here are forty-two names, including Joachim, Balfe, Costa, Gounod, Santley, Reeves, and Paderewski, and with almost all of them he seems to have been on terms of intimacy. It will give some impression of his manner and of the lightness of his literature if we quote a paragraph from his notes on Sims Reeves.

'On one occasion when Sims Reeves was to have sung "The Minstrel Boy" at Brighton, he could not keep the engagement, and sent his son Herbert to deputise for him. Some wag made up the following lines, which I insert here with the willing consent of Herbert Reeves himself:

The Minstrel's son to the Dome has gone,
On the platform, there, you'll find him;
His father's little tricks he has put them on,
But his voice, he's left behind him.'

Messrs. Macmillan have now undertaken the publication of *The Khasis*, by Lt.-Col. P. R. T. Gurdon, C.S.I., and have produced a second edition of that delightful and scientific work.

Four sermons on War preached by Dean Armitage Robinson have been published by Messrs. Macmillan under the title of *Holy Ground* (1s. net). Three were preached during the Boer War; the fourth is new. Of this fourth sermon, preached before the University of Cambridge on the 23rd of August, the theme is the failure of unchristian culture.

The amount of attention that is paid to the welfare of children in America is very great, and a vast literature is at the service of those who take an interest in the matter. But we doubt if many better books have been written than a book called *Problems of Child Welfare*, of which the author is George B. Mangold, Ph.D., Director of the School of Social Economy in Washington University (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). There is no aspect of the subject neglected, and invariably the discussion of a problem is both sympathetic and sane. Among the rest, much attention is given to the playground. That institution is swiftly becoming obsolete in this country—with results. In America it is reckoned more important than the desk. This is the one principle on which the book before us (together with all good American books) proceeds —education is not instruction but development. Dr. Mangold begins his care of the child before it is born, before even its parents are married. He shows among other facts and by means of statistics that, for example, the marriage of cousins means deafness in the children in a greater proportion considerably than the marriage of those that are of less close kinship.

A very elementary introduction to Mysticism has been written by the Rev. T. Wilkinson Riddle

and published under the title of *The Faith of a Christian Mystic* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net). But perhaps it is better than a more learned and extensive book. For we are in danger of knowing all that can be known about mysticism and nothing about God. This book teaches how to become a mystic.

A Pilgrim of the Infinite, by William Valentine Kelley (Methodist Book Concern; 50 cents), has been written to impress upon us the value of Personality and its indestructibility. The style is eloquent, the author is apt at quotation. The last paragraph is the sum of the whole: 'Geometry cannot measure Man; his circle exceeds 360 degrees. Astronomy cannot calculate his orbit; it knows not the equation of his path. A Pilgrim of the Infinite is he; and the old hymn, familiar to our childhood, sings on in our souls:

Thus onward we move, and save God above
None guesseth how wondrous the journey will prove.'

In spite of the number of volumes which seek to show us how to adapt the religion of Christ to the circumstances of our day, the volume entitled *Christianity and the New Age*, written by Mr. George Preston Mains, and published by the Methodist Book Concern ($1.50), will certainly obtain a place and hold it. The first thing one observes in the book is that its author knows the literature of his subject. He quotes the best books and them only. He quotes liberally, but not once in order to fill out his pages, always to strengthen or illustrate his argument. Mr. Mains has no fear for Christ or Christianity. He evidently thinks that we spend too much time upon apologetics. What we have to do is to make Christianity tell on the age we live in. When we have done that we ought to proceed further and show how Christianity will meet the wants of every age, so that the generations that come after may not be taken unawares as we have been. It is a liberal conception of the Gospel that the author holds, but it is the Gospel. With the abundant attempts to apply something to our ills that Christ would repudiate he has no patience. The Gospel, he holds, is quite clear to any ordinary understanding; and it is quite able to deliver and make strong every variety of life and experience.

Unity and Holiness is the title which the Rev. M. Cyril Bickersteth, M.A., has given to a volume of sermons and addresses on the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net). As the title-page tells us, the volume is divided into sermons on the true nature of the Church (preached under the impulse of Kikuyu), sermons on the responsibilities of the Ministry, and sermons on the sanctity of the Sacraments. With the desire for co-operation and ultimate reunion which inspired the promoters of the Conference at Kikuyu, Mr. Bickersteth says he is in full sympathy, but he is convinced that 'the cause of unity is not advanced by the sacrifice of the principle of apostolic order.' His sacraments are seven, and, like other writers on seven sacraments, he makes the distinction between greater and lesser. He even gives reasons for calling the lesser sacraments. His reasons for calling Holy Matrimony a sacrament is that St. Paul calls it 'a great mystery,' and mystery in Greek is the equivalent of sacrament in Latin.

Dr. F. W. Mott, Pathologist to the London County Asylums, has amplified his three Chadwick Trust Lectures delivered last year, and issued them with the title *Nature and Nurture in Mental Development* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). 'From time immemorial,' he says, 'it has been recognised that a healthy body is requisite for a healthy mind, but only within recent years has it been shown that there is a bio-chemical association and interrelation of all the organs of the body, and that subtile chemical substances are poured into the blood by the tissues and organs of the body, especially by the ductless glands and sexual glands. These internal secretions or hormones (ὁρμάω, I excite) play a very important part in the functional correlation of the two master tissues—viz. the brain, the principal organ for the preservation of the individual, and the sexual glands, the organ of preservation of the species.'

To prove this by fact and inference is the purpose of the lectures. There is in them an unexpected hesitancy, unexpected in a medical man, but more reassuring than much dogmatism.

The Religious Tract Society has published *The Universal Bible Dictionary* (3s. 6d. net). The same title was used for a dictionary of the same size which was edited by the Rev. John Macpherson

and published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton in 1892, but it is not a good title. It is impossible to edit a Dictionary of the Bible for everybody; the readers of it have to be definitely in the editor's mind. This dictionary is clearly to be used by Sunday-school teachers and other students of a similar stage of knowledge. It is admirably edited by the Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A., with the assistance of Canon A. Lukyn Williams, D.D. Every title one can think of seems to be in it; and under every title the information given is up to date and conservative.

Take, for example, 'DEGREE, GOOD (1 Ti 3^{13}).—R.V. has "good standing"; a position assured by Paul to those who served well as deacons. Three explanations have been offered—(1) promotion to be "bishops"; (2) reward in the favour of God, possibly to be shown in a future state; and (3) a position of moral influence and authority in the Church. The early Fathers turned to (1); Hort preferred (3). There are no proofs that in the time of the apostle its ministers passed through successive grades; though later on the word here used (*bathmos*) came to mean an order, or rank, in the ministry.'

The supremely difficult matter of cross-references is well managed. Only one slip has been discovered. At RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST there is a cross-reference to ATONEMENT, which does not seem to be satisfied by the article ATONEMENT (THE DAY OF).

We heartily congratulate Mr. Buckland on a difficult undertaking happily and successfully accomplished.

An Introduction to the History of the Church of England, by the Rev. H. O. Wakeman, M.A., has had and still has a steady sale. So the publishers have had the book thoroughly revised by Canon S. L. Ollard, and have issued the eighth edition of it (Rivingtons; 7s. 6d.).

The Royal Asiatic Society has published, as the 23rd volume of new series in their Oriental Translation Fund, *Visramiani*, the story of the loves of Vis and Ramin, a romance of Ancient Persia, translated from the Georgian Version by Mr. Oliver Wardrop.

'The book,' says the translator, 'is an elaborate study of a woman whose whole life was dominated by love. It is certainly one of the oldest novels in the world. Thus it will appeal to historical and linguistic students, but its intrinsic merits give it a claim to universal interest. The love-letters deserve notice as early specimens of this kind of composition, and the lyrical passages (the songs of Ramin) are also worthy of attention.'

All this is true, and more than this. In spite of the formality and prolixity of the letters which Vis wrote to Ramin (did he really read them all?), the interest of the story is sufficient to carry the reader through the book. The very simplicity of its plot is half its success. There is much immorality, but it is in the situation rather than in the actors. For them one thing is supreme—true love, and that redeems all. As a mere work of art it is wonderful; as a psychological study it is more wonderful.

In 1877 Mr. Charles Newton Scott published his first book; in 1914 he has published his second. The first book was called *The Foregleams of Christianity*; the second is called *The Religions of Antiquity* (Smith, Elder, & Co.). It is thus to be seen that Mr. Scott has pursued the one subject of study all these years. The first book had a good reception; the second book finds us better prepared, and we shall be able to appreciate yet more highly its solid merits. Nothing is easier than to fail in an attempt to show how naturally Christianity came out of the preceding religions and religious conditions. Mr. Scott keeps constantly in view the difference Christ made, while he never hesitates to show that He came not to destroy anything that was good, whether in the Law and the Prophets, or even in Fetishism and Polytheism.

The S.P.C.K. has issued some attractive small books in time for Christmas. The most attractive is *How and Where they Lived in Bible Times*, by E. B. Trist (2s. net). It is liberally furnished with colour illustrations of places, and with many in black and white of occupations and the like.

The Values of the Cross, by the Rev. W. Yorke Fausset, M.A. (1s. 6d. net), contains six addresses given in Lent, 1913.

A Great Missionary Pioneer, by Mrs. E. M. Dunlop (1s. net), is the story of Samuel Marsden's work in New Zealand.

Then there are three pamphlets at 3d. each—*The Resurrection* and *The Second Gospel*, both outlines for study and both by the Rev. H. C. Towns-

end, B.D.; and an *Index to the Law of Moses*, by Canon Henry Thompson, B.A.

Mr. Justice Darling has brought his two books *Scintillæ Juris* and *Meditations in the Tea Room* into one volume, and the volume has been published very attractively by Messrs. Stevens and Haynes (5s. net). In spite of Mr. Justice Darling's declaration that he writes for fellow-lawyers, the new edition will be read by all the professions. For time has dealt with these books as it does with good books always, just as surely as with good wine. Here is a very short extract from each: 'The chief difference between prisoners and other people is, perhaps, captivity.' 'Honesty is disgusting to many men of fine feeling because it is represented as a good investment.'

Those who read the papers which Mr. L. G. Chiozza Money, M.P., contributes to the *Westminster Gazette* and other periodicals will rejoice to be told that he has collected the best of them into a volume. It has been published by Mr. Fisher Unwin under the title of *The Future of Work and other Essays* (6s. net). Let us pick out some of the topics: 'British Homes and their Furnishings,' 'The Divorcing of Wealth and Work,' 'Science has solved the Problem of Poverty,' 'Space and Health,' 'Wages and Efficiency.'

Mr. Money is best known as a vigorous opponent of Tariff Reform. But whatever he discusses he discusses with striking persuasiveness, for he discusses nothing that he has not first mastered. And he has a way of setting forth figures and facts so as to endow them with life.

Mr. Sholto O. G. Douglas has written a book to ventilate *A Theory of Civilisation* (Fisher Unwin; 5s. net). It has come at a bad time. We are sick of the words civilisation and culture. And it is a bad book. Practically every statement made in it has to be challenged. To start early. On page 17 Mr. Douglas says, 'Our fathers were not deep thinkers in the Dark Ages, the ages of faith; that is why they were ages of faith.' They *were* deep thinkers; there are few deeper thinkers today. And the Dark Ages (a silly and worn-out epithet) were *not* ages of faith. On the very next page we read: 'It was fitting, perhaps we may say inevitable, that the Christian civilisation should first come into prominence in Italy, the old home of its precursor, rather than in Judæa, the land of its birth, for—on the principle that a prophet is not without honour save in his own country—the Jews saw too much of the real Christ to accept His divinity; it was only at a distance from the historical home of its founder that the great psychic illusion could find its necessary environment.' That sentence is compounded of ignorance and prejudice, and there are no other ingredients in it.

To Messrs. Williams & Norgate's 'Home University Library,' Canon R. H. Charles has contributed a volume on *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testament* (1s. net). This is work that could not have been done until Dr. Charles himself made the materials for it available; and it was just and right that he should be asked to do the writing. He is also best qualified.

The Book of Job.

By the Rev. A. D. Martin, Edinburgh.

There are signs that this scripture is now receiving closer attention than it has ever received before, not only amongst scholars but also amongst the reading public generally. Its peculiarly bold outlook suits the spirit of our age. Its superb vigour of language and dramatic intensity commend it to every artistic mind. Accordingly, we greatly value any work like *The Book of Job Interpreted* (by the Rev. James Strahan) as fulfilling a truly useful function by the presentation of the poem in a form that combines scholarship with popularity. We have needed such help as his, because while here the R.V. is an immense improvement upon the A.V., there is a good deal more required before the average Bible-reader can obtain much idea of the book in its original purpose and meaning.

The problem of the text is extremely difficult

and allows room for some pure guesswork. It is admitted on all sides that Job has suffered much at the hands of editors and transcribers. The fact that the text of the LXX was considerably shorter than the Massoretic text—some 400 lines less in the time of Origen—affords an opportunity for the free use of critical shears. It is an open question whether the Greek translators omitted, or whether the Hebrew transcribers amplified. Mr. Strahan, following Professors Bickell and Duhm, is evidently greatly influenced by the Greek Version. Dr. Driver, on the other hand, inclined to the opposite view. In either case, as has been pointed out by Professor W. T. Davison,[1] the variations of the LXX do not relieve the chief difficulties.

There is a tendency in some quarters to deal with the poem in too modern a way. By cutting out a third line here, and lessening the length of a clause there, the poem may be made more shapely. But is it, or rather was it, as it left the hands of its author, a sort of Gray's *Elegy*, displaying in Mr. William Watson's words—

> The cunning of the jewelled line and carven phrase?

It appeals, surely, as a poem of quite a different order. There is a tumult of passion in it, a palpitation, which, it would seem, must at times naturally overleap even the very free channels of Hebrew versification. There are places where the vividness of debate is so real that, as Mr. Strahan has pointed out, some change in the expression of the faces of the auditors is evidently assumed without being remarked.[2]

One very heartily agrees that certain drastic alterations have to be made. Every one feels the intrusion of Elihu. The missing third speech of Zophar can certainly be restored from an utterance ascribed to Job,[3] but wholly inconsistent with Job's previous and later speeches. The lovely poem on the place of Wisdom in ch. 28 is altogether unsuitable either to Job or to any of the *dramatis personæ*. Finally, the answer from the whirlwind would be far more effective without the laboured descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan.

Nothing, however, is gained by the trimness to which certain scholars seek to reduce the poem. Allowance must be made for the genuine passion of a smitten man, leading him at times into sayings that border upon mutual contradiction. This question of inconsistency is, no doubt, a difficult one to settle. What is flagrant must of course, as already indicated, be ruled out. But the poem is obviously progressive. Job is seen in conflict, not only with his friends, but with his own past. And every one who has had any experience in passing away from an accepted orthodoxy to a larger faith will know how often the mind is invaded by the persistency of discredited ideas.

The temptation to mend the text is, for some people, like the temptation which a schoolboy feels to look up the answers at the end of his book when he cannot make headway with his sum. A little harder thinking over the text as it stands might reveal hidden beauties. If a man cannot see the perfect art of Job's terrible indictment of his Maker in the words—

> I cry unto thee, and thou dost not answer me:
> I stand up, and thou lookest at me (30[20])—

but thinks this second line strange and wants to alter it to 'Thou lookest *not*,' or 'Thou ceasest to regard me' (Duhm), why, one does not know how you can explain it to him, but he should think again. To take another instance of this kind of criticism: by changing a ד into a ך (בְּסוֹד into בְּסוֹךְ) Buhl and, apparently, Mr. Strahan obtain 'when God protected my tent' (29[4]) in place of 'when the secret of God was upon my tent,' but in that case one also gets a commonplace line, instead of one which perfectly expresses a piety at once mystical and practical—the reality of a Divine-human friendship brooding like the shechinah over a man's home. Or once more: when Job exclaims, 'I stand up in the assembly and cry for help,' is it not rather prosaic to find a difficulty in Job's being allowed to stand in the assembly, on the ground that he was a leper? And really, what do we gain if we follow Professor Duhm and, by altering the text, read, 'I stand up in the company of foxes'? This too frequent emendation of the text may stimulate ingenuity, but it often reduces the sublime to the trivial. It certainly makes the work of the preacher needlessly difficult; and, so far as the public become aware of it, it destroys confidence in the Bible, or tends to cast discredit upon a quite necessary branch of the study of Holy Scripture.

[1] Art. 'Job' in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 664.
[2] Cf. Job 6[14-30] and see Strahan, p. 74. [3] 27[7-23].

The most controverted question relating to the integrity of the Book of Job is the relation of the prologue and the epilogue to the poem. By very many scholars these prose passages are ascribed to a lost People's Book of Job. It would not appear that this theory rests upon linguistic arguments so much as upon considerations of a more general kind. Various small points in these chapters, such as the statement in the epilogue that Job lived after his trial 140 years, do indeed confirm the impression, derived from other sources, that the prose framework of the book embodies a personal legend. But to ascribe the authorship of this prose to another than the author of the poem is to assign the root idea of the whole book to that other. For the scenes in heaven described in chs. 1 and 2 are of the very marrow of the drama. They state the theory of suffering which the poem works out. And the question arises, In what period of the history of Hebrew thought are you going to place this theory? Is not the oldest idea of human suffering that which the poet sets out to destroy, or at least to modify? Can you, with a due regard to the propriety of Revelation, suggest any place for the theory of suffering contained in the prologue earlier than the Exile—that is to say, earlier than the time to which the poem itself belongs? As a matter of personal impression, the unveiling of the heavenly courts savours much more of Zechariah 3 than of any pre-exilic literature. Again, the most plausible objection to the authenticity of the epilogue is that in it Job is restored to more than his former prosperity. This, it is thought, is too much in a line with that doctrine held by the friends from which the author clearly dissented. But such an objection reveals a total misconception of the *motif* of the drama. This matter must be viewed in the light of the challenge, 'Doth Job fear God for nought?' If that accusation fails, as it is shown to do, then there is no reason why Job should *not* be blessed with riches. *For the quarrel of the author of the poem with the traditional doctrine is not that it seeks to establish the goodness of God, but that it imputes a narrow forensic motive to His actions.* The achievement of the book is that it pulls down an ancient structure of thought, not to leave it a ruin, but to build another, a larger structure, a spiritual habitation for the mind of man of more permanent make, incorporating the old materials with others formerly neglected. We hold, therefore, somewhat tenaciously to the original unity of prose and poem in this scripture. It was natural for one part to be in prose, because it was narrative which had to be set forth, and Hebrew poetry is essentially lyrical rather than epic. It was equally inevitable that the passion of the great debate should break into verse. But the same genius which shaped the poem gave us also those sublime words of the narrative, and others like them: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'

II.

Having now endeavoured to indicate the material upon which this paper proceeds, let us, in the second place, attempt an interpretation of the book from our own standpoint. Whatever mind one can usefully bring to bear upon the theme must be to a great extent a mind that is indebted to others, and that is yet more profoundly modified by an inner experience of truth, such as under the Spirit's teaching may be the portion of every careful student.

If we could think ourselves back into the life of those to whom this scripture first came, perhaps the initial impression upon our thought would be the feeling of real drama involved in the story. We should wonder how it all could end. For from the very first the issue seems doubtful. The uncertainty is felt in heaven itself. The Lord and the Accuser discuss the character of Job in terms that seem to imply that neither of them is quite sure how things will turn out. The Lord has confidence in His servant, but it is the sort of confidence a father might have in his boy, as, untried and alone, he ventures out into the world. The Lord believes rather than knows that Job will prove true when he passes through the tests of suffering. On the other side, if the attitude of the Lord is one of faith, that of the Accuser is one of reasonable scepticism. It is felt that the Accuser has made out a case for inquiry. Job must be tested to be known.

So the baptism of suffering falls upon him, and as we listen to his words of lamentation, we are made to feel that the issue for a long time remains in doubt. Satan had said, 'Put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will renounce thee to thy face' (2^5). And for a while it looks as though he would. He falls away from his earliest piety in a clearly marked declension. The

first utterance is in the language of perfect submission: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord' (1^{21}). The second shows a lower but still a very real piety: 'Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?' (2^{10}). Then comes the cursing of his day and the beginning of his arraignment of Providence—

> Why is light given to a man whose way is hid,
> And whom God hath hedged in? (3^{23}).

The bitterness of his spirit increases under the provocation of debate, and in the 10th chapter we come to the passage in which the sufferer accuses his Maker of having made him in order to torture him.

> Hast thou not poured me out as milk,
> And curdled me like cheese?
> Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh,
> And knit me together with bones and sinews.
> Thou hast granted me life and favour,
> And thy visitation hath preserved my spirit.
> Yet these things thou didst hide in thine heart;
> I know that this is with thee:
> If I sin, then thou markest me,
> And thou wilt not acquit me from mine iniquity.
> If I be wicked, woe unto me;
> And if I be righteous, yet shall I not lift up my head;
> Being filled with ignominy
> And looking upon mine affliction.
> And if my head exalt itself, thou huntest me as a lion:
> And again thou shewest thyself marvellous upon me (10^{10-16}).

The words remind us of Browning's Caliban watching the ants clambering about their hole—

> He made all these and more,
> Made all we see, and us, in spite. . . .

In such passages Job comes very near to that renouncing of God which had been predicted of him. Yet his attitude is markedly different from that of the typical wicked man of the O.T., whose response to the teaching of the prophet is, 'Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us' (Is 30^{11}). That might be spoken of as a real renouncing of God to His face. For in the history of the Hebrew word בָּרַךְ, here rendered 'renounce,' the turning-point is the idea of saying 'Good-bye' to a person. The sneer of the Accuser is that when Job has to say 'Good-bye' to his property and to bodily health, he will of his own accord say 'Good-bye' to God. But Job's actual attitude turns out to be the very reverse of this. At first, it is true, when Eliphaz urges, 'As for me, I would *seek* unto God' (5^{8}), Job's reply is—

> He is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him
> That we should come together in judgment.
> . . . . . .
> Let him take his rod away from me,
> And let not his terror make me afraid:
> Then would I speak, and not fear him (9^{32-35}).

But gradually the thought of seeing God lays deeper hold upon him, and he becomes confident that if he could receive this vision, all would be well. So strong does this feeling grow that when in the darkness there presently leaps up the conviction of a future revelation—

> From my flesh shall I see God:
> Whom I shall see for myself,
> And mine eyes shall behold, and not another (19^{26-27})—

he is physically prostrated with excess of joy, and the fainting cry escapes him—

> My reins are consumed within me (19^{27}).

This means, of course, that there is a contradiction in Job's attitude. On the one hand, he assails the moral government of God in the most scathing terms; on the other hand, his spirit pants for the revelation of the Divine Presence. Thus it would almost seem as though the duality of attitude in the prologue, respecting the issue of the trial, were justified by the dualism developed in Job, as though *both* the Lord and the Accuser were right, so near does Job go to cursing his Maker, so strongly does he cleave after God's Presence.

This antinomy is a transcript of experience. One meets it in great thinkers like Lucretius, whose scorn of the gods, as Dr. John Masson has shown in his valuable book, was yet accompanied by an essential piety of attitude towards that which may be known of God 'through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity.' 'His feeling for Nature,' says Masson, 'is a reverence which might almost of itself be called worship—a worship which defies his creed' (p. 74). There is, as has been said by another writer, an anti-Lucretius in Lucretius (Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 27, quoting M. Patin). In the same way it may truly be said there is an anti-Job in Job, or rather a Job in the anti-Job. And it is not so much the consummate genius of the artist as the working of true experience which leads the author to develop the discord in the patriarch's

tempest-tost nature into the harmony of a new attitude to God. Boldly does the sufferer appeal against God to God—

Mine eye poureth out tears unto God;
That he would maintain the right of a man with God ($16^{20.21}$).

. . . . . .

Give now a pledge, be surety for me with thyself (17^{3}).

So striking a feature of the poem has inevitably led Christian men to hear in it the call of humanity for an Incarnation. Job's conception of the Daysman, the Heavenly Witness, the After-man, the Avenger, represents a craving such as man at his deepest has ever felt. Yet the writer's thought, while throwing out these great conceptions, does not reach the Christian goal. It looks for a theophany but not an Incarnation. The confident expectation—

> I know that my redeemer liveth . . .
> And from my flesh shall I see God:
> Whom I shall see for myself,
> And mine eyes shall behold, and not another—

is evidently regarded by the author as satisfied by the Voice and Glory from the whirlwind—

> I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear,
> But *now* mine eye seeth thee (42^{5}).[1]

Not even from afar does Job see the Christ. There is no passage in the book which is, strictly speaking, Messianic. And it may be it is for this reason that the writers of the N.T. make no use of material which to us seems so rich in its apologetic value. Hence, however greatly we may appreciate that pluralistic conception of God developed in Job under terrific stress of trial, the main purpose of the poem does not lead us to pursue the logical objective of his craving, but to view the matter subjectively, in its reaction upon his own moral nature. The governing thought in our inquiry must be that of the prologue—the testing of Job's character by fire. And here we notice that it is in strict line with the purpose of the prologue that there comes the cry from the furnace—

He knoweth the way that I take;
When he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold (23^{10}).

The very thing the Accuser had questioned, the integrity of Job, is here exquisitely revealed. It is as though at this point Job had received a glimpse of the scene in heaven, hitherto hidden from him, and had caught for a moment at the secret of his pain—not penalty, nor injustice, but probation, and that in order to the vindication of human worth. Thereafter, even if the clouds should roll down closing the view, nothing avails to destroy the magnificent fidelity of the sufferer.

One other passage of similar nature remains to be noted. It manifests, if less piety and hope, a yet sublimer confidence—

As God liveth, who hath taken away my right;
And the Almighty, who hath made my soul bitter;

. . . . . .

Surely my lips shall not speak unrighteousness,
Neither shall my tongue utter deceit.

. . . . . .

Till I die I will not put away mine integrity from me.
My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go:
My heart shall not reproach me so long as I live (27^{2-6}).

As Dr. Davidson[2] has pointed out, the patriarch here in effect 'proclaims his resolution to adhere to righteousness though God and man alike show themselves unjust.' Could the Accuser, we ask, receive a finer answer than this?

We need not linger long over the Voice from the whirlwind except to indicate how completely it exonerates Job from any worse fault than that of foolish speaking. Whatever the purpose of the Divine Speaker—and that purpose is not very obscure — it is impressive that after the cruel accusations of the friends of Job, and the rigour of their ideas of the Divine Holiness, the Lord Himself brings no weightier charge against Job than that of 'darkening counsel by words without knowledge.' The semi-blasphemous expostulations of Job, his arraignment of God for cruelty and injustice, are simply ignored—a line of procedure on the writer's part which is in strict accord with both prologue and epilogue, confirming our view of the general unity of the book. The Lord addresses Job as though Job were all that He had already in the presence of the Accuser declared him to be. The whole spirit of the speech is conceived in the grand style, with a regal liberality of outlook. It shows us the sweep of stars, the rain failing on a land where no man is, and the wild ass whose house is the wilderness. But a more unethical address was never ascribed to a Holy God. In the circumstances, that is one of its charms. For, obliquely, it repudiates the friends. One feels that they must have been shocked at such a godless God—not that any shocking thing is said, but that

[1] See Kautzsch, *D.B.* Extra, p. 730.

[2] *Old Testament Theology*, p. 270.

so much is left unsaid. For so far as Job is concerned, it seems to be assumed that he does not need any conviction of sin, such as Zophar especially had desired for him. Apparently all that he does need is a wider survey of life. Such sin as may be truly laid against him is but the foolishness of speaking of things too wonderful for him, and to this fault Job had already pleaded guilty in the earlier stages of debate, and does so again when the Lord has ended His address.

In perfect harmony with the Voice from the whirlwind is the closing word of the Lord in the epilogue to Eliphaz: 'My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath.' That also is conceived in the grand, the regal style. Job had said many indefensible things of God, and the friends had been the Lord's champions throughout. Yet look deeper, and it becomes clear to us that, while he whose orthodoxy is untouched by faith in man can never speak rightly for God, he who holds at all costs to his own inner integrity, though the very universe seem against him, is God's *best* vindicator. This is a truth that is foreign neither to the nobler thinkers of antiquity nor to the modern mind. 'The impious man,' said Epicurus, 'is not he who denies the existence of the gods like those commonly worshipped; on the contrary, the impious man is he who asserts the gods to be such as the vulgar conceive them.[1] Tennyson wrote the same when he sang—

> There lives more faith in honest doubt,
> Believe me, than in half the creeds.

Perhaps we may go further. Wordsworth speaks of

> Conscience reverenced and obeyed
> As God's most intimate presence in the soul.[2]

This allusion may seem a little too modern to compare with the thought of a Hebrew poet. And yet is it not true that there is an amazing sense of the oneness of God and man continually underlying the thought of Holy Scripture? A sinner who is believed to have stained his hands with blood and lust cries to God in his distress—

> Against thee, thee only, have I sinned.

In Second Isaiah, as Dr. Davidson writes, 'Jehovah and Israel are not two, but glorified Israel reflects *His* glory.'[3] And the words of our Lord come to us from the Gospel: 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me.' In any case, Job has spoken rightly of his God in that he has declared himself for truth though the heavens should fall.

It is in this there lies the final answer to the Accuser. The question, 'Doth Job serve God for nought?' implied the absence of any core of reality in Job's worship of his Maker. And it is seen that in the thickest darkness and deepest pain Job holds to the things that are of God—uprightness of spirit and hatred of evil. The thing which in every age the world demands to see in the religious man—secret truth—is revealed beyond possibility of cavil.

The question which may rise in our minds, however, concerns the fictitious character of the story. Historic fact may lie behind the poem. Spiritual fact is certainly embodied in it. But the work, with all its passion, is obviously a free treatment. Hence we may still be tempted to ask, Do people really act like this? Surely we may cling to at least an affirmative *hope*. The case of John Hus comes to our mind as that of one whose martyrdom was not so much in defence of truths men counted heresies—for in matters of doctrine Hus did finally agree to the findings of the Holy Council—as in defence of his own integrity leading him to refuse a formal retractation of things he had never said or done. A nearer parallel to the case of Job is that of an obscure Turkish martyr, of whom Mr. Lecky tells us in his *History of Rationalism*,[4] Mohammed Effendi, who died in defence of the doctrine of Atheism. Nearer still, and yet also infinitely far away, is the death of our Lord. The cry of dereliction, rendered as Bengel preferred to translate it, and as surely the aorist here should be rendered (ἐγκατέλιπες), 'Why *didst* thou forsake me?' shows that Jesus knew a vacancy at least as desolate as that of Job, and yet was silent until around His spirit He felt the returning clasp of God. By that cry we are reminded that not only the upright man but the Holiest of all suffered, maintaining a stainless front, yet not knowing the reason of the

[1] Diog. lx. 123, quoted by Masson, 410.
[2] *Works*, 455.
[3] *Old Testament Theology*, p. 262.
[4] 'Although there is no recompense to be looked for, yet the love of truth constraineth me to die in its defence.'—Lecky, ii. 371.

sternest element in His pain, learning in this thing also to be made like unto His brethren. So the final vindication of human worth is after all in history. We meet it in the cross of Christ.

As we sum up this brief study of Job we return once more to its author's purpose. Negatively, he sought to modify, if not to destroy, the doctrine of suffering, as commonly held in Israel up to the time of the Exile, and as he himself no doubt had once believed it. But his aim was positive too. It seems plain enough that he put in place of the penal doctrine a doctrine of probation. That brings his work into comparison with a third view of the problem, one belonging, probably, to his own period of Hebrew history—the theory of *vicarious* suffering in Second Isaiah. There is no necessary conflict between Job and Second Isaiah, excepting where it may be said that in the latter we have a view of suffering not perfectly cleared from the old legalistic notion. In so far as any conflict exists at all, the honours may be divided. The teaching in Second Isaiah approaches the truth of the cross of Christ more nearly in expressing the love that can suffer for guilty men, while the teaching of Job is nearer on another side, in understanding the suffering undertaken as sympathetic rather than as penal.

The doctrine of Job is, then, a doctrine of probation, and the question arises, Will this stand the tests of experience any better than the penal theory? In the form of the poet's thought, 'No.' God cannot need to experiment with His creatures in order to discover their worth. And we have got beyond the mediæval conception of a public opinion in the Kingdom of God that requires to be considered. But the way in which a good man will bear great adversities will often reveal the genuineness of his piety by developing it. 'A deep distress doth humanize his soul.' May we not say that Job becomes a greater man through the agency of pain? He sees life no longer from the viewpoint of an Arab chieftain, but from that of the outcast. His thought of God is both corrected and enlarged. One might easily make too much of his appeal against God to God; and yet a man who has made that appeal can never again think of God as a monad, and that means a gain. It is an open question how far certain passages in Job's speeches indicate the dawn of faith in an afterlife. Certainly Job set out from the usual unhappy view of that subject, and we cannot decisively say he ever transcended it. But the man who has once challenged the hopelessness of his age with the question, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' and the heart of his Maker with the prayer, 'Thou wouldest have a desire unto the work of thine own hands,' is not likely in the hour of returning peace to acquiesce in the thought of another and a final separation from God.

So if suffering is neither always penal nor always probationary, it may yet be creational. And just as we enter the world through the pains of another, so the sufferings of the present time may be inevitable to the shaping of a future birth. In any case, if we are deepened by the things we endure, it will not matter so much whether or not our theories are correct. Our words of wind and language of revolt may be to a regal God only the wrath that praises Him—a thing at worst immaterial, so long as the integrate soul grows deeper in its capacities for the Divine, so long as the words of Job continue to receive fulfilment—

> Yet shall the righteous hold on his way
> And he that hath clean hands shall wax stronger and stronger (17⁹).

For as this personal direction of our experience is maintained we are drawn into the richer life of the Spirit of God, and, in the language of a recent writer, we then begin to 'assist in the spiritual transfiguration of the universe.'[1]

[1] Boyce Gibson's *Eucken*, p. 17.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS.

ROMANS v. 20.

And the law came in beside, that the trespass might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly.

THESE words of St. Paul unfold to us some daring as well as profound thoughts. 'The law entered that the offence might abound.' And God sent it; God would have the offence abundant. The sin was already there. Deep in the constitution of humanity the poison was already working, and God would have it developed, in broad, full, strong manifestation. The driving of evil out to the surface, where all can see it in the broad daylight, is, as in some deadly forms of fever, the first step towards the cure. But there is the revelation of a daring as well as a powerful intellect in the broad simplicity of the statement. 'The law entered that the offence might abound.' Paul had not ventured to entertain the thought unless he had known, as no man, save perhaps Luther, has ever known, the superabounding, the overmastering power of grace.

The infinite tenderness of God to sinners is the broad and blessed fact of the gospel. To the uttermost, to the lowest depth of wickedness and misery, to the crumbling edge of the pit of perdition, to the last step, the last cry, the last gasp, He is able, willing, waiting, with intense desire to save. God's utter hatred of sin, and His fixed determination to uproot sin, lie underneath the everlasting gospel. By righteousness alone, God's righteousness, can a soul be saved. But if sin be in the heart let it work itself out, let the poison spread through the whole system, let the corruption taint the whole world, then grace shall reach it, grace shall rule it, grace shall cure and save its victims; and so, 'as sin hath reigned unto death,' grace shall 'reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.'

Before entering upon the main theme it is necessary to glance at the thoughts which the text brings before us in regard to the Mosaic Law. The Law had a shadow, as we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of good things to come. The metaphor is most expressive. It was a shadow, unreal in itself, though testifying to a reality; dim in its intimations of what at last was to be fully manifested—a shadow, gloomy and sometimes threatening, but only the other side of a resplendent light, and a love full and free in which all humanity would rejoice.

1. *The Law seemed even to defeat itself.*—Instead of making men good, it often provoked their evil propensities. The 'Thou shalt not' of the Divine commands, crossing men's passions and desires, prompted the 'I will' of an unchartered licence; just as the sign-board, 'Trespassers will be prosecuted,' tempts some to climb the fence and enter the forbidden territory. Thus the Law worked in men all manner of self-assertion, and actions contrary to both its spirit and letter: 'the law came in that the trespass might abound.'

2. But that was not the object of the Law. *Its first object was to make known God's will* and so to enlighten man's conscience. Owing to the entrance of sin into the world man's foolish heart was darkened. In the progress of the centuries the earth became corrupt, and evil in the life brought about confusion of thought in respect to questions of morality and religion. The conceptions even of men like Abraham and Jacob, though enlightened by Divine revelation, were extremely primitive, and undeveloped. The Law given by Moses altered that. It revealed a holy and a jealous God, and it erected a standard of morality which covered man's life, and showed him what he was to shun and what he was to pursue and practise.

3. In consequence the Law, in quickening conscience, *produced a knowledge of sin.* It showed men the contrast between what they were and what God required, and taught them to look at their conduct not only as it affected themselves and others, as vices which enslaved, or misdeeds which did their neighbours wrong, but as offences against God, as affronts to the Majesty of Heaven. The Law convinced men of sin; it exhibited an ideal from which they fell short.

The village painter struts before his glowing daub with an exultation that is fed by the praise and wonder of his still more ignorant neighbours. But he happens to visit London.

He is attracted to one of the exhibitions of paintings. The great masterpieces awe and humble him, for though he cannot apprehend their excellence, he can see enough for his own condemnation. The law—the Perfect of beauty as expressed in these high reaches after itself has entered his soul, and has made the imperfections and offences of his own poor work to abound. And in all such cases the offence abounds in proportion to the entrance of law. And since law, or rather that Perfect which law represents, can only be gradually apprehended, the abounding of offence will at first be narrow, but it will widen with every increase in the knowledge of law. And we have already seen that this has been the case with the conscience of sin in the world. The first great step, then, in the process of man's salvation is to make him know himself as a being almost infinitely below the standard of perfectness in thought and feeling and act. He must be led to see, with more or less distinctness, that his heart is desperately wicked, since all its movements are obedient to the selfish law. He must be led to desire with more or less earnestness that these movements may become obedient to the love of God; that he may have a new heart and a right spirit. And when these changes are wrought—when there is crushed from the depth of his being the agonizing cry, Behold I am vile, I abhor myself! the work of salvation has already commenced, and the heart has begun to stretch out its hands after a purity that is not in itself.[1]

4. With this knowledge of sin there arises *a consequent fear of punishment.* The Law had its sanctions. It pronounced a sentence against the guilty. And the force of its denunciations and threatenings was greatly increased by the direct sovereignty which was exercised by Jehovah over His people. The Law written on tables of stone was no dead letter; it was not an abstract system of ethics, powerless to carry out its mandates, it was linked with a Divine government which marked disobedience with active disapproval. To the accusations of conscience were added the positive inflictions of penalty by Him who ruleth in His power for ever. We believe that all spiritual laws execute themselves, and that misery attends transgression in the way of natural and inevitable results, but over and above this, God often made bare His arm and vindicated His authority by terrible things in righteousness. The visitation of the serpents in the wilderness, the conviction and destruction of Achan in the camp, the calamities which befell David for the sin by which he displeased the Lord, the ruin which ultimately involved the whole nation because of its apostasy and idolatries—these were acts of retribution which at once put a seal to the conviction of sin which came by the Law, and proved how contrary all sin was to the ineffable Divine Nature.

[1] W. Robinson, *The Philosophy of the Atonement*, 25.

On the banks of a river there stands a mill where poisonous chemicals are manufactured. And for a long time the drainage from the mill into the river carries sickness to the villagers half a mile down, who use the water. But the mill-master knows not the mischief done by his mill. Then at last the poisoning of the water is perceived. And if still he permit the evil, his innocent hurt of others has become a guilty hurt. The knowledge of that hurt is an entrance of law which makes the offence abound.[2]

5. It may be added that *law produced sorrow and regret* in those whom it awakened to a sense of sin. There can be no true sense of sin, however it may have been brought about, without some degree of sorrow. It may be only the sorrow of humiliation that we should have fallen short and dishonoured ourselves; it may be a selfish sorrow in which the chief concern is that we have become caught in its miserable consequences; or it may rise above this into a recognition of our failure towards God, expressing itself in the heart-felt confession, 'Against thee, thee only, have I sinnèd'; but whether shallower or deeper, and whatever its cause, there will be some inward pangs and self-reproach. That is how God has made us. He has implanted within us a conscience which acknowledges the Divine law, and a heart which is pained by departure from it.

But now let us turn to the contrast which Paul institutes between (1) Abounding Sin, and (2) Superabounding Grace.

I.

Abounding Sin.

There is a trend of thought to-day which makes light of sin, regarding it as the mere negation of good, and excusing it on the ground of heredity, or unfavourable environment. But all such representations of the subject, which are sometimes advocated with the desire of exalting human nature, really lower and belittle it. It is because man is a spiritual being that transgression in him is not a trifle or a misfortune, but a big thing and his fault. The existence of sin will be denied by none. The signs of it and the havoc it has wrought are everywhere apparent.

This is a world of ruin; it bears the mark of disorder in all its elements.[3]

1. *Sin abounds in that it has affected all mankind.*—There is no man that sinneth not. As we move

[2] W. Robinson, *The Philosophy of the Atonement*, 28.

[3] J. Liefchild.

in life we come into contact with men and women distinguished for various excellences, and yet they have sinned. There are no garments free from stain. Only One has ever lived amidst the conditions of our mortality of whom it may be truthfully said, 'He did no sin.'

2. *Sin has persisted through the centuries.*—History traces man's course from early times, but it is always a story of man's folly and wickedness. Sin, having once entered the world, maintained itself generation after generation, and in spite of the restraints of the Divine government, the accusations of conscience, the lessons of experience, and the influence of the Christian gospel, still reigns in human hearts, and controls human lives. Sin abounds in the quality of persistency.

3. *Sin abounds in the estrangement which it creates between man and God.*—Man was made for God and might have formed his highest happiness in fellowship with God, walking with Him, as Enoch did. But no sooner had man sinned than he shrank from God, and by sin's evil operation threw off the Divine authority, and eventually became rebellious and defiant. For, as Paul writes, 'Man did not like to retain God in his knowledge.' This is always the effect of transgression. It separates the soul from God, awakens sentiments of antagonism, leads to false views of the Divine character, and results either in the adoption of anti-Christian errors or in utter indifference and neglect of all religion.

It is a fact—and the explanation is to be found in an evil conscience—that there is something in human nature which would drive man away from his Maker. When his better feelings would prompt him to fall down before God, a hand from behind is felt to be holding him back, and he hesitates and procrastinates till the time for action is over. Thus, when nature is displaying its loveliest scenes, he would be inclined to look to that light in the heavens whose beams gladden them all; but the eye is blinded by its excess of purity, and turns back instantly to the less dazzling landscapes of the earth. In the hour of adversity the desponding feelings which, for the health of the soul, should be allowed to flow out towards God, are repressed and bound up from all inspection, and they fester within till they pollute the heart and rankle the temper, and burst out in misery and crime.

Under these influences, sometimes clashing, and at other times concurring, man acts in one or other of two ways. He concludes that God is taking no notice of him, and he follows the bent of his own inclinations; or, in the dread of punishment, he betakes himself to superstition and idle ceremonies, to excruciating sacrifices and acts of will-worship, supposed by him to be fitted to pacify an angry God. Some give themselves up to the one, and some to the other, of these impulses; some are Sadducees, and others are Pharisees; some are Epicureans, and others are Stoics; some are Infidels, and others are Devotees. The majority of mankind flit between the two, between unbelief and superstition; now, when in health, giving themselves to the wildness of the one, and now, in trouble, clinging to the strictness of the other, and generally remaining in a kind of neutral territory, like the false prophet's coffin, seeming to hang by the heavens, but truly upon the earth. Mme. De Sévigné expresses, with her usual *naïveté*, the feelings of multitudes: 'I wish very much I could be religious. I plague La Mousse about it every day. I belong at present neither to God nor the devil; and I find this condition very uncomfortable, though between you and me the most natural in the world.'[1]

II.

Superabounding Grace.

Sin and grace are the two great words of the Christian religion. They lie at the very heart of the gospel of Christ. To fail in the understanding of the one is to miss the meaning of the other. Wrong views of sin always issue in false interpretations of grace. The Epistle to the Romans has come to be regarded as the very core of the gospel, because it deals so completely with these two fundamental words. The fifth chapter sums up the great exposition in its broadest issues as represented in Adam and Christ. Between these two there is a parallel and a contrast; a parallel in the representative character of their works, and a contrast in the operation and issues of their representative acts. The sin of Adam involved the whole race in ruin; the righteousness of Christ restored men to the justification of life. That is the parallel. Apart from any consent or effort, all men are involved in the curse of the first and the atonement of the second. The act of the one is the act of all, and the results of the act are shared by all. The contrast is set forth in the five times 'much more' of the chapter. The disobedience of Adam spread sin over the whole race, the obedience of Christ gathered the sins of all unto Himself. From Paradise there went forth the stream of death; from Calvary there flows the river of life. The grace of God in Christ has cancelled sin and destroyed the works of the Devil. Grace has abounded over sin.

Some years ago I witnessed the construction of a piece of engineering work in South India which illustrates this text strikingly. Travancore, on the western slope of the Ghauts, is well watered; Madura, on the east, was, until lately, dry and parched except during the annual rains. The project

[1] J. McCosh, *The Divine Government, Physical and Moral*, 47.

consisted of three parts: the erection in Travancore of the biggest dam in the world across the bed of the Peryar, by which an immense lake was formed, the construction of numerous channels to the bed of the Vaigay, the only stream on the Madura side, and the boring of a tunnel through the Ghauts to connect the lake with the bed of the Vaigay. The bed of this small stream formed a safe guide as to the course which the great river (*pery*=great, *ar*=river) would take. But there was this difference, the high-water mark, reached only during the monsoon rains, was the mark to which the present stream reaches throughout the year. From its feeble source the water of the Vaigay gradually worked its way to the ocean. But contrast that source and its feeble stream with the great lake and the perpetual torrent that now flows through the tunnelled rock. If the old river extended far, surely this great river will flow equally far; and not only so, for mark the high-water mark of the old river and know that that level will be maintained constantly by the new. Such is the fulness of the grace of God in Jesus Christ.[1]

1. Grace puts forgiveness within the reach of all. The gospel, then, round which our thoughts gather, is that man is a spiritual being directly related to God, and that every human soul is an object of God's gracious care. In every man God has a personal interest. He deals with us in the mass, for He sees us with all our surroundings and history, and He makes every allowance. He deals with us one by one, for He loves every man, and has redeemed every man in His Son. God stands related to us not simply through the operation of universal and unbending laws, but by a direct and loving contact. Towards every individual He will reveal Himself with perfect wisdom, perfect righteousness, perfect love. He will not show weak indulgence to any, but a wise and righteous love to all. All souls are His, and there is not one, however far gone astray, however sodden in sin, however involved in the evil network of circumstances and habits, however overpowered and crushed by temptations that proved too strong, however despised and cast out by religious and social Pharisees, but that unhappy soul still belongs to God, and for it the Saviour died. To such souls the All-Merciful is saying, 'Why will ye die?' and when He deals with them it will be in sovereign righteousness and love.

What, then, is the difference between a saved and an unsaved man? Simply this, that one has accepted his pardon and the other has rejected it. Personal acceptance is the only condition of personal salvation. A man may make the Cross of Christ of none effect, and, though racially saved, be personally lost.

[1] Jacob Thompson.

In Queen Victoria's Jubilee year, 1887, I was in Edinburgh. Passing over George IV. Bridge one day, I saw a picturesque procession of civic dignitaries going to the old Cross near St. Giles' Cathedral. There was a great crowd, and I turned and followed them. After a great fanfare of trumpets a Royal Proclamation was read, declaring the Queen's forgiveness of all deserters from the Army and Navy. I was not near enough to hear the terms of the proclamation, but I understood that all the deserters now pardoned should report themselves within so many days at the nearest military or naval dépôt. I afterwards met two of them going to the Castle. What were they going for? To be pardoned? Nay, they were pardoned already. It had been publicly proclaimed. They went simply to claim the certificate of their pardon; not to beg for it, but to claim it. Is that too strong a word to use of the sinner's forgiveness? Let St. John answer: 'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.'[2]

2. Grace perfectly reconciles God and man. Instead of estrangement between God and man, through Jesus Christ, there is love and fellowship. God's love flows forth to man, man's love is kindled towards God. Perfect love casts out fear. Not only are the effects of sin counteracted; man is restored to the Divine image, and raised into a Divine sonship. The blessings which accrue surpass man's warmest desires. He learns the meaning of the 'much more' of the Saviour's promise.

There is an expression used over and over again in the Bible to describe the salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ, which gives a view of that salvation, so amazing and so perfectly satisfying, that I cannot help wondering whether any of us have ever yet grasped its full meaning. One thing is certain, that no one who should grasp it could ever be uncomfortable or miserable again. It is the expression, 'much more,' and it is used to tell us, if only we would believe it, that there is no need which any human being can ever know that cannot be 'much more' than met by the glorious salvation that is provided. But we are continually tempted to think that 'much less' would be a truer word; and that, so far from this salvation being 'much more' than our needs, it turns out in actual experience to be much less. And this 'much less' view, if I may so express it, is in danger of making our whole spiritual lives a misery to us.[3]

3. The truth of our text, while very precious to all, makes its special appeal to two classes of individuals. These are—

(1) *The tempted Christian.*—There have doubtless been times, in the experience of most of us, when we have been living specially near to God, and walking in the light of His countenance, and when, on a sudden, the sin that

[2] S. Chadwick, *Humanity and God*, 34.

[3] Mrs. Pearsall Smith, *The God of all Comfort*, 118.

dwelleth in us has seemed to attack us just when we least expected it. The fiercest temptations often come to us immediately after our highest enjoyments of communion with God. They seem to come like a sharp draught of cold air the moment we step out of a warm room, and we hardly know what to do for the best, we are scarcely prepared for it. It will sometimes happen that a temper which we thought we had quite overcome will rush upon us like a lion out of a thicket; or a passion which we thought had been most effectually conquered will come sweeping down upon us like a hurricane from the hills, and our poor little skiff upon the lake seems well-nigh overwhelmed with its furious onslaught. Then, as we look at ourselves, and are surprised to find so much sin in our hearts, we know that sin abounds; what do we do then? At such times, Christians try to nestle closer than ever under the wings of God, and they feel humbler, and they go to the precious blood of Jesus with a more intense desire to prove again its cleansing power; they cry to the Strong for strength, and they feel more than ever they did before their need of the Holy Spirit's sanctifying power. Ralph Erskine said that he was more afraid of a sleeping devil than of a roaring devil; and there was good reason for his fear, for when the devil was roaring, the saints would be more on the watch than when he was quiet. The worst temptation in the world is not to be tempted at all; but when there is a strong temptation, and your soul is fully aware of it, you are on your guard against it. The wave of temptation may even wash you higher up upon the Rock of ages, so that you cling to it with a firmer grip than you have ever done before; and so again, where sin abounds, grace will much more abound.

(2) *The open sinner.*—Let us take the case of the open sinner. What have you been? Have you grossly sinned? Have you defiled your body with unhallowed passions? Have you been dishonest to your fellow-men? Does some scarlet sin stain your conscience. Have you grown hardened in sin by long perseverance in it? Are you conscious that you have frequently, wilfully, and resolutely sinned? Are you getting old, and have you been soaking these seventy years in the crimson dye of sin till you are saturated through and through with its colour? Have you even been an implacable opponent of the gospel? Have you persecuted the saints of God? Have you tried by argument to batter down the gospel, or by ridicule to put it to reproach? Then hear this text: 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound'; and as it was in the beginning, it is now and ever shall be, till this world shall end. The grace of God, if you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, will triumph over the greatness of your wickedness. 'All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men.' Throw down your weapons of rebellion; surrender at discretion; kiss the pierced hand of Jesus which is now held out to you, and this very moment you shall be forgiven, and you shall go your way a pardoned man, to begin a new life, and to bear witness that 'where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.'

Richard Jefferies says: 'It is strange to think of, yet it is true enough, that beautiful as the country is, with its green meadows and graceful trees, its streams and forests and peaceful homesteads, it would be difficult to find an acre of ground that has not been stained with blood . . . the nameless skirmishes of the Civil War, the cruel assassinations of the rival Roses, down to the axes of the Saxons and the ghastly wounds they made. Everywhere under the flowers are the dead.'

That is the way of the flowers. They carpet the land, and make us forget about the 'old, unhappy, far-off things, and battles long ago.' They remind us, in their rich profusion, of the abundance that God has provided in the spiritual realm, the abundance of grace that can cover up all the sin and shame of our life—'Grace to cover all my sin.' As every acre of ground has been stained with blood, so every part of our life bears the marks and the stains of sin. Sin is no scarce or stinted thing. Police courts have no monopoly of it, churches have no lack of it. It is not confined to the dark places of the earth and the places of horrid cruelty. It abounds in our own life. Can you pick out any sinless day, any day at whose close you did not need to come to the throne of grace for mercy to pardon and grace to help? But where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly.

Literature.

Brown (J. B.), *The Divine Life in Man*, 71.
Chadwick (S.), *Humanity and God*, 21, 34.
Howe (J.), *The Living Temple* (*Works*, iii.), 306.
Jenkinson (A.), *A Modern Disciple*, 86.
McCosh (J.), *The Divine Government, Physical and Moral*, 45, 47.
Robinson (W.), *The Philosophy of the Atonement*, 25, 28.
Smith (Mrs. P.), *The God of all Comfort*, 118, 119.
Spurgeon (C. H.), *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, xxxiv. (1888) No. 2012; liv. (1908) No. 3115.
Christian World Pulpit, xlii. 116 (R. Thomas).
Preachers' Monthly, vii. 373 (J. Liefchild).

The Place of Prayer in the Christian Life.

By the Rev. John R. Legge, M.A., Chesterfield.

1. The place of prayer in the Christian life is the same as the place of prayer in human nature. And if the Bible be taken as recording a revelation of man as well as of God, the reading of the pages of the book in which all our members are written will end with a very sure and certain conviction of what the place of prayer is in human nature.

In that recorded revelation of human nature the first man who prayed was Enosh. Not Adam, the first man; nor Enoch, who walked with God; but Enosh. He is the first man to introduce us to the world of prayer. He was the first inhabitant of this planet who was also at home in the inner world of prayer. He was 'the first who ever burst into that silent sea,' where 'the upward glancing of an eye when none but God is near,' is prayer. It was in the days of Enosh, says the revealed version of human nature, that 'men began to call upon the name of the Lord.' He was 'the first man, God-conquered, with his face to heaven upturned.' Enosh means 'man in his frailty and weakness.' 'The radiant morn' of humanity had 'passed away.' The ideally happy family that the story of the Garden of Eden stands for had suffered an eclipse of its splendours. About Enosh is no romance nor halo. He is frail, weak man. But he is the praying man. He is the origin of a new species of man—the praying man. He is a missing—almost lost—link in the ascent of man. He is a type of man pioneering in the spiritual world, setting out upon unpathed territory, blazing, amid the sun-smitten shadows of the forest primeval, a new and living way of access by prayer into the presence of the All-Father. Enosh launched out on to the deep with a personality which he felt to be 'a ship of the soul.' Others pushed out their little skiffs: soon they felt 'an ampler ether, a diviner air.' Their souls had sight of 'that immortal sea which brought us hither.' They 'heard the mighty waters rolling ever more.' 'Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord.' The place of prayer in human nature assigned by the Scriptural revelation of human nature, is central and fundamental and pregnant. Man is God-conscious from his birth; but it is when he awakes to the consciousness of himself as frailty and weakness, that prayer rises like a fountain. None can fix the date of the opening of this fountain. But they have eyes that see not, and ears that hear not, and mouths that speak not, and other senses that are sealed up, who are not aware that in the Biblical revelation of human nature there flows a stream of prayer, that deepens as it flows—waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed through—life-giving whithersoever it runs. The place of prayer in the Christian life must be identical with its place in human nature.

2. The place of prayer in the Christian life is the same as the place of prayer in the life of Christ. This would appear to be obvious. Our Saviour was a man of prayer. We owe to Luke, the beloved physician, our main and clear knowledge of the praying Jesus. His Gospel is the camera that focuses this view of our Saviour. The earliest occasion when Luke lifts the curtain upon the inner life of the Saviour, is at His baptism. We read: 'Now, when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened.' This is an interpreting touch of the physician's own. When the waters of baptism had been over Him, He went up out of them *praying*. What follows is God's answer to the Saviour's prayer. He who in after days taught, 'Ask, seek, knock, and ye shall have,' taught them with authority. He had a positive gospel of prayer—the ripe fruit of His own experience.

The next time on the pages of Luke that we see Jesus praying is after the cleansing of a leper. After that mighty work what does Jesus do? He withdrew into the wilderness and prayed. Why? Jesus was a spent man after that mighty deed. Miracles are exhausting operations. Going about doing good takes it out of Him. Away then to solitude, to nature, and to God, for refreshment, for additional equipment, for refilling of the cell-batteries of the soul. 'This teaches much which it is easy and fatal to miss.' *We* have felt drained and spent, weary in well-doing. Have we been like the Master who recruited Himself for new service by 'continuing in prayer' to God? After

'out-go' of power, Jesus found 'in-come' of it by prayer.

The pages of Luke also show that Jesus was steadfast in prayer when on the eve of great experiments and deep experiences. The appointment of Apostles was a great experiment in aggressive Christianity. The eve of that day in the Calendar of the Church was spent in prayer. All night He prayed; and when it was day, He chose the twelve Apostles. All of us can see how critical the moment was: how far-reaching the consequences of that choice.

As to His great experiences. We have seen the connexion of His baptism with prayer. Luke points out that for the day on which Jesus told His disciples that He was to die, He similarly prepared Himself by prayer. He did not find it easy to let them know. Prayer enabled Him to break the news. The last day which He spent as a free man left, as its closing experience, Jesus agonizing in prayer in Gethsemane. He withdrew a stone's cast, and prayed. He went away a second time and prayed. He went away a third time and prayed, saying again the same words—'Not my will, O Father, but thine be done.'

There awaited Jesus the insult of the mob who broke in upon His loneliness, the betrayal of Judas, the midnight trial, and all the scorn and contumely that accompanied it. But He bore Himself so loyally that the governor exclaimed, 'Behold your King.' Prayer did it. He had fortified the soul in that fashion. Gethsemane was the key and citadel of Golgotha. Such was the place of prayer in the life of Christ.

It must be the same in our life in Christ. Who of us would not be wiser, better, happier, more useful, were we to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest what is told us of Jesus praying in full prospect of great enterprises and experiences?

3. The place of prayer in the Christian life is the same as it has had in the lives of all great Christians. Luther said that the busier he was the more he needed to pray; and did it. Luther had vast enterprises and great experiences to send him into the school of Christ in prayer.

Principal Whyte calls William Law a discoverer in experimental religion; and claims that it was his practice of prayer—especially intercessory prayer—that made him so; and proclaims that for a man so immersed in controversy as was the author of the *Serious Call*, only prayer could have enabled him to achieve the victory that he won over the sin that doth so easily beset a controversialist.

But the description 'great Christians' has been used above because the phrase was used by the late Marquess of Salisbury in his parliamentary tribute to his great contemporary, Mr. Gladstone, who was described as 'a great Christian.' What was the place of prayer in the life of the man so described? We know now better than ever. Morley's 'Life' of Gladstone illustrates this weighty sentence from the pen of the late Dean Church. 'The stronghold of a true man's life is not near the frontier but somewhere far away, remote and lofty, and lonely.' A reviewer of the 'Life' says: 'Perhaps there rarely has been a man who has had such a great Inner Kingdom of his own into which he constantly retired and in which, amid all this tumult and tempest of outer activity, he usually dwelt—a great Inner Kingdom of isolation and prayer.'

How will the seasons and occasions of prayer in this life of a great Christian stand the test of the place of prayer in the life of Christ, which must be the standard of judgment? He entered into the great enterprise of political life with prayer. He met the great emergencies of that life with prayer. At its most critical moment he was overheard praying, 'O turn thee unto me, and have mercy upon me. Give thy strength to thy servant, and keep the son of thine hand-maid.' The great temptations and the bitter disappointments of the parliamentary life were overcome by the place that prayer had in the life of this great Christian. The place of prayer in the Christian life must be the same as that which it has had in the lives of all great Christians—'the saints who are the excellent of the earth.'

4. What, then, is the place of prayer in the Christian life? It is the place of power. It is the place of power for witness to God, and of power with God. It also has manward power. That the place of prayer in the Christian life is the place of power is the position arrived at from consideration of its place in human nature (according to the records of revelation); its place in the life of Him who bore a perfect human nature; and also its place in the lives of all great Christians. It is the place where the strength in our weakness is dis-

played. It was in the uncalendared days of his history, when man knew himself to be frail and weak, that 'men began to call upon the name of the Lord,' and grew to be sure that there was the voice of One who regarded and answered.

When the race was in its childhood, it was like a brood of nestlings in the nest. The nestlings know that they are fed from above. And so they look up and are fed. Man was born with instincts that compelled the upward glancing—and from above the hunger of his soul was met. Surely it is impossible to be mistaken here. It is true that silence falls upon this world of prayer at times: that generations are born, and marry, and beget sons and daughters, and die. But when the days of man's history can be calendared, chronicled, and compared, what we see is not only a national conviction of the power of prayer, but also a succession of men,—not only contemplative men, but men of action like Abraham, Moses, Samuel, David, Elijah, Isaiah, and Nehemiah,—who were all of them men of prayer—persistent, pleading prayer. Were these men fools? Were they duped when they believed that there was an answering Voice and a regarding Person? Was that an hallucination? We have had our own men of action who were also men of prayer — Alfred, Knox, Cromwell, Wesley, Gordon, and Gladstone. Were these the dupes of a Divinity that never was? It is impossible to believe it. And so the place of prayer in the Christian life is the place of power that witnesses for God Himself. It is an argument that 'he is, and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him.'

But prayer is also manward power. Principal Forsyth calls prayer 'the forge of personality,' and teaches that it is for religion what research is for science. By it we get into contact with realities. The soul is thereby brought into contact with its own nature; *i.e.* God. And on that account Dr. Forsyth enjoins men to use the Bible greatly in prayer. For it is the most original work on prayer; not prescribing but inspiring it; and so is corrective of the spirit of criticism which so easily besets and assaults men in these days.

The forge of personality! The metaphor is strange. But is not the experience that of wrestling Jacob? 'In his manhood he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed.' Who is willing to go into God's forge, and be beaten on God's anvil in order to have the iron enter into the soul; in order to obtain those qualities of endurance, resistance, toughness, and purity, which mean the redemption of our personality?

> He takes my softened heart and beats it;
> The sparks fly off at every blow.
> He turns it o'er and o'er and heats it;
> And lets it cool, and makes it glow:
> *And yet I whisper, 'As God will,'*
> *And in His mighty hand hold still.*

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford.

What we now know about the Hittites, and its bearing on the Hittites of Genesis.

In a *Miscellany* which has just been presented to Dr. Mackay of Liverpool, Professor Garstang has given a short, but very comprehensive, *résumé* of the present position of 'Hittite Studies.' No one was so well qualified to write it as the excavator of Sakje-gözü and the author of the standard work on *The Land of the Hittites*, a second edition of which is likely soon to appear. In my recent review of Professor Eduard Meyer's book (*Reich und Kultur der Chetiter*) I stated that my decipherment of the Hittite hieroglyphic inscriptions had forced me to the unexpected conclusion that they all—or nearly all—belonged, not to the earlier Hittite empire of Boghaz-Keui, but to a second Hittite empire established by the Moschians about B.C. 1200, of which Tyana was the capital. It is still a question what relation the Moschian language of the inscriptions bears to the language of the cuneiform texts of Boghaz-Keui and

Arzawa: they doubtless both belong to the same family of speech, but we shall probably find that the relation between them is pretty much that of French to Italian. At all events the Moschians will have formed part of the northern hordes who overthrew the first Hittite empire and occupied the land of the Amorites, according to the Egyptian annalists, and whose invasion of Egypt was defeated by Ramses III. They represent 'the Cilician empire' of the classical writer Solinus which was finally overthrown by the Assyrians.

The conclusion at which I have thus arrived on philological grounds has been also arrived at on archæological grounds by the excavators at Carchemish and had already been maintained by Professor Garstang on historical grounds in his *Land of the Hittites*. He was led to this conclusion by his archæological observations at Boghaz-Keui. It is very unfortunate that the excavations there fell into German hands by a series of accidents, for which Hamdy Bey, the Director of the Museum at Constantinople, was not responsible, instead of being conceded to Professor Garstang, as I had hoped and been promised that they would have been. No archæologist was attached to the German expedition: Professor Winckler was a philologist without any archæological training, and his companions were architects. The consequence was that while the results of the work were all that could be desired on the architectural side, we should have known nothing of the archæological history of the place had not Professor Garstang happened to be there for a few days and been allowed to superintend some of the work. Short as the time was, however, it enabled him to see that there were two periods of construction at Boghaz-Keui, and that a second and somewhat inferior city, with its own special style of art, had risen on what were probably the ruins of the first. To this second city belonged the arched gateways and sculptures and possibly the walls of the citadel. Professor Garstang supposed that the second city was a restoration by the native Hittites of the earlier city that had been destroyed by the Moschians; the inscriptions now make it clear that the Moschians themselves were the restorers.

Similar results have been obtained in Carchemish and its neighbourhood. Mr. Woolley (*Annals of Archæology*, February 1914) divides the archæological history of the site into six periods, the first of which represents the Neolithic Age. Then come the three periods of the Hittite or Bronze Age, characterized by an intrusive race who introduced the use of bronze, burial in stone cists and new types of pottery. Period II. is distinguished by tall vases on stems resembling champagne glasses, and, like the other pottery of the period, wheel-made, not hand-made as in the Neolithic Age. Period III. Mr. Woolley calls 'Transition,' and dates before B.C. 1750 (this should be corrected into B.C. 1950, as it was in the reign of the Babylonian king Samsu-ditana that the Hittites invaded Babylonia. The astrological tablets of two centuries earlier show that they were already formidable to the Babylonians). Seal-cylinders rudely imitated from those of Sumerian Babylonia have been found in the graves of this period. The pottery of the time is characterized by what is called 'ring-burnishing,' especially if it is black ware. The native Syrian painted pottery of the neolithic epoch had long since disappeared. The 'Middle Hittite' Period IV. followed on Period III.

With Period V. the Iron Age begins, which Mr. Woolley dates from B.C. 1100 to 718. (This should be corrected into B.C. 1200–718.) This is the period of Moschian influence and domination, to which the sculptures and hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered at Carchemish belong, as well as the characteristically 'Hittite' seals. Iron takes the place of bronze—the Moschians, it must be remembered, having descended from the iron-producing country of the Khalybes—and there is a wholesale change in the burial customs, the dead being cremated and the ashes deposited in urns, accompanied by weapons of iron and bronze fibulæ of Cyprian type. The old pottery makes way for Cypriote and Greek Island ware and its imitations, and Egyptian amulets and scarabs are found by the side of conoid seals of paste. Terra-cotta clay horses and similar objects are also found in the tombs.

Period V. or 'Late Hittite' is the period of Assyrian rule and extends to B.C. 605, the date of the battle of Carchemish, which gave Western Asia to Nebuchadrezzar. With Period VI. we arrive at the Persian and Hellenistic age.

As far back as the age of the Babylonian dynasty of Ur (B.C. 2500) there were already Assyro-Babylonian colonies in Cappadocia; silver, copper and lead mines were worked in the Taurus, and the roads of eastern Asia Minor were traversed by Babylonian *damgari* or commercial travellers.

Postmen passed to and fro along them carrying not only letters but even a species of cheque, written, however, not on paper but on clay. Babylonian culture, which was essentially literary, soon made its way among the Hittite tribes, who assimilated the theology of Babylonia to their own religious ideas and adopted the cuneiform script. But along with this they continued to use their own peculiar hieroglyphs, as I have found a hieroglyphic inscription on a sealing upon a Cappadonian tablet, now in the Royal Scottish Museum, the date of which is about B.C. 2400. When the Amorite dynasty established itself at Babylon in B.C. 2225, 'the king of the Hittites' was a formidable rival of the Babylonian monarch, and appears from time to time in the astrological tablets by the side of 'the king of the Amorites.' In fact, the fall of the Amorite dynasty seems to have been due to the Hittite invasion of Babylonia. At this time the Babylonian empire extended to the Mediterranean and embraced Syria and Palestine. Hence it is not surprising that an Egyptian stela, now in the Louvre, should mention Hittites in the extreme south of Palestine in the early years of the Twelfth Egyptian dynasty, as was first pointed out by Brugsch.

In agreement with our present archæological knowledge, the book of Genesis also states that there were Hittites in the same locality in the time of Abraham. They appear to have occupied Hebron much in the same way as their successors occupied the cities of Canaan in the Tel el-Amarna age. They were the ruling military caste, distinct from the Amorite natives or 'people of the land' (cp. Ezk $16^{3.45}$). This raises the question whether in our present text of Gn 23 a later copyist or editor has not misunderstood the document which lay before him, and omitted the copulative conjunction between the words 'children of Heth' and 'people of the land' or 'all that went in at the gate of the city' [1] in vv.$^{7.10.18}$. This would explain the statement that Ephron 'dwelt among the children of Heth' (v.^{10}) which is otherwise unintelligible and upon which the words 'Ephron the Hittite' would have been a later gloss. It is noticeable that in making his bargain with Ephron Abraham is said to have spoken 'before the people of the land' only (v.^{13}); on the other hand, the transaction was not valid without the sanction of the Hittite magistrates and overlords. All this was in accordance with the Babylonian law and custom of the day.

[1] The final *waw* in *'irô* (Assyrian *uru, eri*) is not the possessive pronoun but the old nominative termination.

Contributions and Comments.

John xi. 45.

THE average English reader understands this verse as if it said, 'Of the Jews who came to Mary and saw the miracle, many believed,' and as if it implied that some of them disbelieved. As a matter of fact, the verse says, 'Many of the Jews believed, that is to say, those who came to Mary and saw what Jesus did.' The Evangelist affirms without qualification concerning the Jews he has mentioned in v.^{19}, that they were many, and that in the end they believed.

It is, I think, possible to trace the steps whereby these men were gradually led up not from bitter enmity, but from aloofness and uncertainty to a definite faith. I venture to think it is an entire mistake to regard them, as some do, as the bitter enemies of our Lord, or to accuse them of 'sneers' and 'crocodile tears.' One may regard them as being at first undecided what to think of our Lord, and afterwards becoming through this miracle, definite believers in Him.

Consider the position at Jerusalem. Day after day our Lord was teaching and preaching: He was also working miracles, and in all things He was displaying to the full the Divine love and power and wisdom. But the ruling classes rejected Him and hated Him. This fact, however, does not prove that there were not many of the Jews who kept silence, who did not commit themselves, as well as some who sincerely believed.

What then of the Jews mentioned in v.^{19}? It is most unlikely they were our Lord's bitter enemies. Men who were enemies to our Lord could hardly have been cordial and sympathetic to His devoted friends, such as Martha and Mary. Nor would

Martha and Mary have welcomed the friendship of men who blasphemed against their adorable and beloved Lord. The Jews who came to Bethany to condole must have been willing to tolerate our Lord and His teaching.

The next thing we read about them is in v.[31]. We are told that they followed Mary out of the house, thinking she was going to weep at the grave. They wept with her as they went along. But instead of going to the grave, Mary went to a place outside the village, where our Lord was standing. The Jews were following her all the time. When she met the Lord, she fell at His feet and worshipped Him.

Now if the Jews were behind her, they must have seen this act of adoration. They had not expected anything of the sort: they had no idea our Lord was near. They were surprised, but it does not appear that they went away or made a protest of any kind. If they did not, they became committed to a toleration of the worship of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I now come to vv.[36. 37], and I cannot see that in these verses the Evangelist attributes any insincerity or hostility to the Jews. When they saw Christ weeping, they said, 'Behold how He loved him!' They were weeping themselves for love and sympathy, and they recognized the same love and sympathy in Christ. Some of them went on to ask if the death of Lazarus could not have been prevented. 'Could not this man which opened the eyes of him that was blind, etc.?' How far-fetched to regard these words as a scoff! It is the very same thing that Martha and Mary had said. And the reference to the man born blind makes the case all the stronger. If they had hated our Lord, they would have buried away in their hearts the remembrance of a miracle they could not deny. That they should make a miracle they themselves acknowledged the occasion of a scoff, or the ground of an argument against Him, this surely is impossible. Also if the words were meant as a scoff they would have been put in the form of a direct assertion, and not interrogatively. They would not have said, 'Could He not?' but, 'He could not save this man from death.' Lastly, these Jews of v.[37] must have been of the number of those referred to in v.[45], who believed after seeing the miracle. These men of v.[37] 'came to Mary,' they also apparently remained to follow her until the miracle had been performed: therefore according to v.[45] they believed. If they believed on seeing the miracle, they could not have been hardened scoffers a few minutes before. Miracles strengthen a weak faith, they ripen an incipient faith, but they cannot convince an obstinate unbeliever. Among commentators on the Gospel, Westcott and Sadler take the view of v.[37] that I have here taken.

If then the Jews of v.[45] are the same Jews as are mentioned in vv.[19. 31. 33. 36. 37], it seems possible to trace some of the steps by which they were prepared for receiving the great miracle and making answer to it by giving consent to the claims of the Lord Jesus Christ. Our Lord had foretold that the sickness of Lazarus would turn out to the glory of God and His own glory (v.[4]), and so it was. God was glorified, Christ was glorified by the faith of those who believed as a consequence of the miracle.

The facts stated in vv.[31-33] naturally lead us to suppose that the Jews there spoken of saw Mary throw herself at the feet of our Lord, and we may fairly conclude that the sight had influence in leading them from doubt to faith. But if this be so, it furnishes a strong argument in favour of the literal historical truth of the story. A writer of imagination would have stated in so many words that the Jews saw Mary adore Christ. He would have laid stress on every detail calculated to give verisimilitude to the story. This writer does not need to do anything of the sort: he has no lurking doubts either of the truth of his story or of its acceptance by his readers; he has no need to call attention to details; he simply relates what facts he thinks necessary, being sure that his readers will accept them on his assurance. The conclusion is so obvious that it need not be stated.

A. D. Mozley.

Oxford.

Prophetic Trances.

The description given us in 1 Sam. 19[20-24] of a certain type of prophetic trance seems more akin, I suppose many of us instinctively feel, to the religious ideas and practices of Hindoo fakirs or of Mohammedan dervishes, than to an intelligent and spiritual form of religion. However, let that be as it may. It is not for us to say that this crude form of religious expression is worthless. If the feeling to which I refer is instinctive, we can

quite well believe that there were some in Israel who would look upon the same thing with aversion and contempt. Does not this explain the words of Michal in 2 Sam. 6^{20}? Is it not to a prophetic trance of this kind that she sneeringly alludes? Is not her tone that of the refined, 'superior person,' who scorns religious forms and modes of expression which find favour with the common people? J. Willcock.

Lerwick.

Lewisian and Curetonian Versions of the Gospels.

In our last article we put forward the suggestion that there are morphological features which seem to claim for the Lewisian Version an unquestionable priority of time over the Curetonian, and probably also over the most ancient patristic and biblical writings that the classic Syriac possesses. Our attempt would lack safety if on the other side of the question it can be weakened by the statement that our Version is a post-Tatianic composition. To avoid such an objection, and to corroborate our opinion by some possible coincidences between both texts, is the aim of the following lines.

Before we examine the subject in the light of a textual comparison, it would be useful to form an idea of the internal value, for a critical study, of the Diatessaron made known in the Arabic Version elaborated in the eleventh to twelfth century, and published by Ciasca in 1888. To sum up the outcome of the scientific researches of some scholars on this version, we may be allowed to state that it would be at least too rash to attribute to it a preponderating authority for a general criticism of the text of the Gospels, and for the reconstruction of the original and authoritative Syriac text as current in the Eastern Church from the end of the second century approximately till the middle of the fifth. The reasons why we think so may be succinctly expounded as follows:—

1. About the baptism of our Lord the Syriac writer Isho'dâd quotes the following passage of the Diatessaron:[1] 'And all at once, a great light shone, and white clouds were gathered over the Jordan, and many troops of spiritual powers were seen, praising in the air. And Jordan stood still quietly from its course, its waters not moving; and an odour of perfumes was scented from thence.'—These verses which Tatian inserted in his Harmony from an apocryphal source, and which doubtless constituted an integral part of its text, are not found in the Arabic Version edited by Ciasca, whose narration in this point is quite orthodox.

2. Isho'dâd quotes again Tatian's Harmony about Mt 3^4 in the following manner: 'His food was honey and milk of the mountains (wild).'[2] The Arabic Diatessaron has according to the current version of our days: 'His food was locusts and wild honey.'[3]

3. Isho'dâd again commenting over the opening verses of St. Mark testifies that in the Diatessaron written in Alexandria, instead of 'as it is written in the prophet Isaiah,' there is simply 'as it is written in the prophets.' The Arabic Version[4] mentions clearly the name of the prophet Isaiah. A fragment from Barṣalîbi, published by Dr. R. Harris,[5] confirms Isho'dâd's quotation.

4. If Barṣalîbi, the famous Monophysite writer, has any claim to reliance, and so far we have no reason to suspect his authority in this subject, the history of the Resurrection was not found in the Diatessaron: 'Ammonius and Tatianus wrote the Gospel called Diatessaron, *i.e.* of the four, as we stated above, but when they came to the history of the Resurrection and noticed that it was told in a different manner, they abstained from their works.'[6] The Arabic Version contains this history in the most orthodox sense.[7]

Therefore, if on the one hand the Arabic Version

[1] *The Comment. of Isho'dâd of Merw*, edit. Margaret D. Gibson, 1911, p. 45.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 39.

[3] Edit. Ciasca, p. 15 (we refer to the pages of the Arabic text).

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 13, 14.

[5] *Fragments of the Comment. of Ephram Syrus upon the Diates.*, 1895, p. 16.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 20.

[7] Pp. 199–209.

of the Diatessaron preserves faithfully the *order* followed by Tatian in his Harmony, as some very able critics assert, on the other hand it derives its text almost certainly from a Syriac manuscript which had unhappily received the utter influence of the Pshiṭta, an influence rendered necessary by the christological movement of the fifth and the sixth century. Consequently its wording corresponds generally with that of the Pshiṭta, and it is *per accidens* that here and there we can glean some words which escaped the attention of the revisor who tampered so cruelly with the well-known work of our Mesopotamian hero. Some of the coincidences which in Matthew's Gospel seem to establish a dependence of the Diatessaron on the Lewisian text may be summarized as follows:[1]—

11^{22}. D. (p. 12) L. 'And *he saw* in a dream.' P. C. 'And *it has been shown to him* in a dream.'

11^{20}. D. (p. 59) L. C. 'Great work' or works. P. '*His* great works.'

17^{15}. D. (p. 94) L. 'Have mercy on me.' P. C. '*Lord*, have mercy on me.'

20^{16}. D. (p. 113) L. 'The called are numerous, and the chosen are few.' P. C. '*Because* the called are numerous, and the chosen are few.'

22^{34}. D. (p. 130) L. C. 'But the Pharisees, when *they saw* that He had put the Sadducees to silence.' P. 'But the Pharisees, when *they heard*.'

24^{37}. D. (p. 161) L. '*Because as it happened in the* days of Noah.' P. '*But* as the days of Noah (*were*).' The Curetonian is missing.

27^{31}. D. (p. 193) L. 'They took off from him the garments *that he was wearing*.' P. 'They took off from him the raiment and put on him his garments.' The Curetonian is missing.

26^{28}. D. (pp. 170–171) L. 'This is my blood; the new covenant.' P. 'This is my blood *of* the new covenant.' The Curetonian is missing.

3^{10}. D. (p. 15) L. 'The *roots* of the trees.' P. C. 'The *root* of the trees.'

4^{21}. D. (p. 21) L. 'And (when) He *approached*.' P. C. 'And when He *went on*.'

These quotations prove in an indubitable manner that a certain *rapprochement* exists between D. and L., though to what extent it is not in our purpose to discuss at present. We believe, too, that D. is again under the influence of L. in the following list of the Apostles (Mt 10^{3-5}):—

Diatessaron (quoted by Isho'dâd, edit. Gibson, p. 6): 'Simon whom he called Cepha, and Andrew his brother, and James and John sons of Zebedee, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Thomas, and Matthew the publican, and James the Labbæus son of Alphæus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas the son of James, and Judas Iscariot who became betrayer.'

Lewisian: 'Simon Cephas, and Andrew his brother, and James and John sons of Zebedee, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Thomas, and Matthew the publican, and James son of Alphæus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas son of James, and Judas Iscariot who became betrayer.'

Zahn (*Theol. Litt. Blatt.*, Oct. 18, 1895) and some critics under his authority point out that it is the Diatessaron which in this list has influenced the Lewisian. Till some positive reasons are given for the probability of this hypothesis, we deem the contrary assumption more plausible and more in harmony with the genuine researches on the subject. On the other hand, a too accentuated freedom in dealing with a sacred text is far more easily attributed to a man who attempted to mix in a homogeneous whole the disunited parts of a narration than to a scrupulous translator whose only aim was to render into another language, as faithfully as possible, the original placed before him. But what was exactly this original in the middle of the second century?

A. Mingana.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

[1] D. (Diatessaron), L. (Lewisian), C. (Curetonian), P. (Pshiṭta).

Psalm 145.

In Edinburgh some time ago I had the pleasure of meeting Pastor Storjohann of Christiania, who gave me a copy of one of his books on the Psalms, *Psalmernes Bog historisk belyst og i oprindelig*

poetisk Form fremstillet. The position he takes in this volume is that the Psalms ascribed to David in the Hebrew Psalter can be proved to be his by the aptness with which they fit into the circumstances of his life as recorded in the historical books. I fear he will find few scholars to accompany him in this to-day. But his comment on the 145th Psalm is so interesting, I take the liberty of bringing it under the notice of the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. He considers it the last product of David's poetic genius.

'That this Psalm is David's great, all-comprehensive, praise finale we have clear testimony in 1 Ch 29[10-13]. It is reported here that David, after the people's freewill offering for the Temple which was to be built, for which David had received a writing from the hand of God (1 Ch 28[19]), praised Jehovah before the eyes of the whole assembly: but this reproduction of David's song of praise follows the fundamental thoughts in Ps 145 step by step, while at the same time the Psalm expands further in praise of the Lord's goodness and righteousness (v.[7-9] and v.[17]). Compare the course of both songs of praise as follows:—

1 Ch 29.	Ps 145.
v.[10]. Blessed be thou, for ever and ever.	v. [2]. I will bless thy name [1, 2]. for ever and ever.
[11]. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness,	[3]. His greatness.
,, might,	[4]. Thy mighty acts.
,, glory,	[5]. glorious honour,
,, majesty:	,, thy majesty,
,, all in heaven and in earth	[9]. all his works.
,, thine is the kingdom,	[11-13]. thy kingdom (in every verse).
,, exalted above all,	[13]. His dominion for ever.
[12]. Come of thee, (from thy face)	[15]. The eyes of all wait upon thee; and thou givest them
,, thy hand	[16]. thy hand,
,, makes all things great and strong	,, satisfies every living thing.
,, unto all.	[17]. all his ways,
	,, all his works.
	[18]. all who call on him,
	[20]. all who love him:
[13]. We thank and praise thee.	[21]. let all flesh bless his holy name.

This observation, which is here made for the first time, may be taken to be so striking that one will certainly accept with pleasure the light and the special interest which falls on the Psalm as David's last word, his song of praise to Jehovah's honour. "And all the congregation . . . worshipped the Lord and the King," it is said on that occasion in 1 Ch 29[20], and David's word in the Psalm v.[1], "My God, O King," shows us that in 1 Ch 29[20] by "King" is meant God, and not David.'

It cannot be denied that the parallel is very striking, and Pastor Storjohann's claim to be the first to draw attention to it seems justified. Neither the Variorum Teacher's Bible nor the Revised Version with references has a single marginal reference to 1 Ch 29, and no Commentary at my disposal notes the resemblance. Is it accidental? Or has the Chronicler, without the commentators noticing it, summarized the Psalm in order to find suitable words for David on the occasion? Or is Storjohann's theory after all correct in this case, that we have here the Swan Song of the Sweet Psalmist of Israel?

JOHN A. BAIN.

Westport, Co. Mayo.

Entre Nous.

Anna Bunston.

The story of *Jephthah's Daughter* has taken hold of the imagination of the whole Bible-reading world. It has taken hold of the imagination of a true poet of our day, Anna Bunston. The book so named, which has been published by Mr. Erskine Macdonald, is a drama in five acts. It contains this song, sung by Mahlah, Jephthah's daughter:

O purple wooded Gilead,
O country loved of God,
O place of wells and waters,
The land our fathers trod.

Thy shittims bloom like morning
A-golden with the sun,
And bear their fruit like evening
Red with a day that's done.

Upon thy mountain pastures,
The dappled goats may go,
The kine and ewes deep-uddered
Feed where the fountains flow.

Thy leaping, laughing waters,
Thy little singing rills,
Flow down where Jordan gathers
Her children from the hills.

Thou hast all precious unguents
Of terebinth and rue,
For thee the bruised balsam
Drops down her healing dew.

And strong on hills of Gilead
Still stand the oaks of God—
But other footsteps follow
Where once our fathers trod.

Katharine Tynan.

A collection of the Devotional Poetry of Katharine Tynan has been made and published under the title of *The Flower of Peace* (Burns & Oates; 5s. net). It is a Christmas gift of universal acceptance. Let us quote one poem:

GOOD FRIDAY.

Good Friday is a heavenly day,
So bright, so fair, so still;
They slay the King of all the world
On a high hill.

The birds sing sweet and low,
With a most quiet mirth;
They scoop a hollow grave for Him,
The holiest head on earth.

Good Friday is a heavenly day,
New lights on earth and sky:
The day the Saviour of us all
Went forth to die.

Sweetly it rose and fell,
So calm, so light, so grave.
Christ Jesus, sacrificed for men,
Died—and forgave.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. Jacob Thompson, St. John's College, Jaffna, Ceylon, and the Rev. J. S. Maver, Paisley.

Illustrations of the Great Text for December must be received by the 20th of October. The text is Ps 51^4.

The Great Text for January is Phil 4^{19}—'And my God shall fulfil every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.' A copy of Dobschütz's *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Ro 8^{28}—'And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose.' A copy of any volume of the *Great Texts of the Bible*, or of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for March is Ro $7^{24.25}$—'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for April is Ac 26^{28}—'And Agrippa said unto Paul, With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian.' A copy of Law's *The Tests of Life*, or of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, and Shaw's *Christianity as Religion and Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Two series of volumes, five volumes in each series, have been published under the general title of 'The Scholar as Preacher.' A third series began with a volume by Dr. CLIFFORD, entitled *The Gospel of Gladness*—a volume as characteristic of this scholar and preacher as any that he has ever published. The second volume in the series is entitled *The Seer's House* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net). Its author is the Rev. James RUTHERFORD, B.D.

What right has Mr. RUTHERFORD to a place in this series of books? He is a scholar, although he and Canon W. H. HUTTON alone have not yet proceeded to the doctorate degree. But is he a preacher? We shall test him by a sermon.

We shall not test him by the first sermon in the book, nor by the last. These two are always to be avoided if we would appreciate a preacher's preaching. These are exceptional. We shall test Mr. RUTHERFORD by a sermon which lies in hiding very near the middle of the volume. It has the simple title of 'Christ's Word to Simon.' The text is Lk 7^{40}: 'And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on.'

'As you read the Gospels, you cannot but notice this—how much of the teaching of Christ is Table-talk. It is not preaching; it is conversation. It does not come to us from bench or pulpit, not from any artificial altitude. It comes to men as they sit at table in social fellowship.'

That is the beginning. Then, after contrasting Christ in this regard with John the Baptist, he says: 'You remember also how some of the best books in the world's literature come to us in this form. How much of the wisest and the wittiest is not the product of the study and the midnight oil, but is given off in the free play of mind with mind in social fellowship. It is Table-talk. We think of Luther's, Selden's, Coleridge's *Table-talk*, Goethe's *Conversations*, and Boswell. These are living books, full of quick, intense interest, often far more interesting, because far more truly revealing the mind and the man, than works that are much more careful and elaborate. There is a spontaneity, a sincerity, a heartiness, a lively vigour and impressiveness about such speech, that is more attractive than the finest writing. It shows the man when he is thrown suddenly on his resources and must speak out in answer to whatever the occasion demands.'

The example of Samuel Johnson is recalled effectively. Then—'This is what we have from Christ—not sermons or essays, not preaching, but conversation. Imagine the talk in any house,

at any table, when He was there—such wise and weighty and winsome talk! "Never man spake like this man." He was always ready for any question, any sudden challenge, for anything the situation should require, any opportunity it might provide. He was always ready to look across the table to host or guest, and say—"Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee."'

That is the introduction to the sermon. Then comes the exposition. Three facts are discovered. The first great fact discovered in the text is that *Christ has always something to say.* We are arrested at once with the description, not a word wasted, of a situation in which we have found ourselves, when we have had to break silence and knew the advantage of having something to say. 'Many a difficult situation is relieved by a word; and we thank God for the man who has "something to say." That man has the power; for knowledge is power—and wisdom and speech. In any society the leadership goes to him. Whatever we may say of the worth and the beauty of silence, I think that in this world it is ever true that the man who can speak is the master of those who cannot speak. Keep your eyes open, and you will see it. The advantage is ever with the person who has something to say.'

Christ had something to say. 'On the grandest scale this is the power of Christ—that in this world of ours, with its problems and its mysteries and its miseries, in this strange life of ours, sitting with men beside Him, men often going wrong, wanting to go right, asking what it all meant—just there He had something to say. When all the rest are silenced, or at best perplexed, He speaks. This is His place in every company where He appears, in every house He enters, in every life He visits. He has something in His mind and in His heart—Oh! if He could only tell it, and if we would only hear it, the darkness would lift, and we would be happy and at peace. He is, and ever must be, in every company the Prophet who can speak.'

The second fact is that *Christ has always something more to say.* 'There are people who have something to say, but when they have said it they have nothing more to say. You know the kind of people. The second time you meet that man he tells you the same stories, he makes the same reflections and remarks. You have got to the bottom of that well already, come to the end of his resources.'

'But Christ is different. He has always something more to say. He is simply endless. You never exhaust Him, never come to the last word. This is the characteristic of His teaching as it is of Himself—that while it is so simple, coming near to us in familiar words, we feel that in His wisdom there are heights and depths beyond all that we know. It is "His fulness," not the fulness of the pitcher, but the fulness of the fountain—the brimming well.'

Then follows, well expressed, one of the wonderful things about Christ, quite familiar, but always wonderful. 'He rises above all the centuries with a message to the Twentieth Century as truly as to the First. The time never comes when Christ has nothing for us, the hour never comes when we feel that we have come to the end of Him. Let knowledge grow, let life advance, and He is still in front of us. We never overtake Him. Find yourself where you may, confronted by any experience, Christ will have His peculiar message and gift and greatness; we turn from every other teacher to cling to His feet, saying, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." You can always say to Him, as Simon said, "Master, say on." Yes, on and on; say more and more; for Christ has always something more to say.'

The last great fact is that *Christ has always something personal to say.* 'Simon, I have somewhat to say *unto thee.*' But now we have given enough of the sermon. There is never a moment's loss of interest. Even when the preacher speaks

of himself he speaks also of his hearers' experience—the only way of redeeming the personal note from egotism. 'Have you never had this experience—when someone far above yourself in intellect or in place has spoken to you? I remember such an experience in a dark day in my own life, when the man, for whom of all men living I had the greatest veneration, spoke a word to me, because he knew that I needed it. I have never forgotten it, never forgotten the spot where that word was spoken. Believe me, it is this personal note of kindness and knowledge, of sympathy and interest, that makes life precious.'

So the word to Simon was a word of sympathy. It was a kind word. That is the last lesson, and it is made very emphatic.

The Rev. A. J. Mason, D.D., Honorary Fellow of Pembroke and Jesus Colleges, Cambridge, and Canon of Canterbury, has prepared a volume on *The Church of England and Episcopacy*, which has been published handsomely by the Cambridge University Press (10s. 6d. net). We say the volume has been *prepared*. For it consists of 'a catena of passages,' to use the author's own words, 'from Anglican writers, from the Reformation to the Catholic Revival of the nineteenth century, for the purpose of showing their views on the origin, the sanction, and the obligation of episcopacy, and on the position which we ought to hold in relation to non-episcopal communities both abroad and at home.' It is one of the results of the Kikuyu controversy. Canon Mason's purpose in gathering together these passages from Anglican writers is to show that Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Christian Church.

The book is reviewed in *The Churchman* for November. The reviewer is the Rev. H. A. Wilson, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Norbiton, Kingston-on-Thames. Mr. Wilson recognizes at once that Canon Mason's desire is to meet the loud call which has lately been made for 'a restatement of the High Anglican position on the Christian Ministry.' And he recognizes also that that position rests upon the reality of Apostolical Succession. Canon Mason sees that as clearly as Mr. Wilson, though he does not express it so clearly. A considerable portion of the book is occupied with the evidence for that doctrine, no fewer than fifty-five theologians (according to the Index) being quoted in its favour.

Now the doctrine of Apostolical Succession 'has fallen upon very bad times.' Mr. Wilson quotes the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, who stated in *Foundations* that 'with regard . . . to the sense, if any, in which what is called Apostolical Succession may legitimately be asserted as a literal fact of history, the evidence is almost, if not quite, non-existent.' And then, 'it is scarcely possible,' he says, 'to exaggerate the significance of these words, coming as they do from one who was then a tutor of Keble College. It is as if one in the immediate entourage of the Sultan of Turkey were to express doubts as to the existence of Mahomet, or a member of the Papal College suspicion as to the Episcopate of St. Peter. Doubt as to the very fundamental essential of High Anglicanism has invaded the college founded for the express purpose of fostering and preserving those views! This is but one of many indications that the need is great for believers in the High Anglican view of the ministry to present their case forcibly in the light of present-day historical criticism.'

Canon Mason has come to the rescue of the doctrine. Has he rescued it? 'If it is possible,' says Mr. Wilson, 'to fasten Apostolic Succession on the Church of England, Canon Mason has done it; and if he has failed, we are quite confident no one else has a chance of success.' Mr. Wilson proceeds to prove that he has failed. 'We have read the book, and are confident that the case has been put in the strongest way by an author who is as conspicuous for his scholarship as for the respect and affection with which he is

regarded in the Church; but we have put it down still utterly unconvinced and entirely unrepentant. We have not found adequate evidence to make us waver in the conviction that our Church's attitude, as expressed in its formularies and by the actions and words practically of all its great divines, was one of brotherly regard and Christian courtesy towards non-Episcopalian Churches.'

How is it, then, that Canon MASON is so well satisfied? There are three reasons. The first reason is that he is not, and does not profess to be, impartial. The conclusion that he reaches is the conclusion that he set out to reach. The second reason is that in spite of the size of his book and the multitude of his quotations, there are, and there were bound to be, serious omissions. These omissions, if they were supplied, would make the impression more 'complex' than it really is. The third reason is that naked quotations, apart from their historical context, are often gravely misleading, and there are such quotations here.

Of the first reason something will be said in a moment. Of the second Mr. WILSON gives two examples. One of these is Archbishop Whitgift. Canon MASON quotes Whitgift freely as an uncompromising Episcopalian. But Whitgift said this: 'That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind, thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny.' And he also said this: 'I deny that the Scriptures do set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church, to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places, without alteration.' Canon MASON does not quote these passages.

The other example is Bishop Jewel. Several times Jewel is referred to by Canon MASON as 'a stiff upholder of Episcopacy as an integral part of the faith,' and extracts are made from his writings which are fairly strong. 'But we are not given the passage from the "Defence of the Apology" in which Jewel declares that if all the Bishops of the English Church were cut off, it would be no vital matter, she would not have recourse to Rome for a new succession—which reminds us of a well-known High Anglican who, in lecturing upon the Diocletian persecution, remarked that at one time Diocletian had all the Bishops of the Church in his clutches and, had he known it, by cutting off their heads he could have severed the Church from the channels of Divine grace. Happily, however, the Emperor did not hold High Anglican views upon the ministry!'

The third reason why Canon MASON is satisfied is that he had failed to consider the context of his quotations. It is impossible to estimate Hooker, Whitgift, Cooper, and others aright if the conditions under which they wrote are ignored. They had to state the case for Episcopacy against keen and not over-scrupulous opponents, and they had to put that case as strongly as they were able to put it. 'Their adversaries were bitter and narrow men, who saw in Bishops the "mark of the beast" and the Woman of Babylon, who maintained that our Church had barely taken the first step to Reformation, who used vile and coarse abuse of every Bishop. When we remember this, we get the right perspective in which to view the words of our defenders, and the same applies, with some necessary qualification, to the works of Caroline and post-Restoration writers.'

But the chief reason why Canon MASON has failed and does not know it is that his mind was already made up. How that affected his selection of passages Mr. WILSON is not sure. But he is quite sure that it induced him to pass over the evidence of the Thirty-nine Articles and all the pre-Elizabeth work upon the Prayer-Book. 'The fact that in the compilation of the Prayer-Book the Continental Churches were consulted, and their advice often acted upon, has apparently no significance for him. The fact that refugees from England at the time of the Marian persecution communicated freely with Continental non-Episco-

palians is unmentioned, as also is the fact that, when the exiles from the Continent fled to England, they were given churches to worship in, and minister their sacraments to the present day in those churches. Bishop Gore once said that the Church of England would be rent asunder the day non-Episcopalians ministered at Anglican altars. This practice began in Elizabeth's reign, and is going on now in the Dutch Church in Austin Friars! A Huguenot congregation worships to-day in the crypt of Canon Mason's own cathedral.'

The root question which Mr. WILSON asks is this: Did the Reformation, Elizabethan, and Caroline divines regard the foreign Protestant bodies as Churches or not? If they did so regard them, then the obvious and inevitable conclusion is that they did not consider Episcopacy as essential to the existence of a Church. He maintains that the evidence mentioned proves that they not only admitted freely and fully the status of the Continental Churches, but acknowledged their equality with the Church of England. The farthest the old High Churchmen generally would go was to regard the Continental Churches as not so perfectly organized or so fully blessed as their own Church. A High Churchman like Andrewes could write that a man 'must be stone-blind that sees not Churches standing without' Episcopacy; and a stanch Laudian like Bramhall was of opinion that 'there is great latitude left to particular Churches in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment.'

Canon MASON has not prepared his book in vain. He has given Mr. WILSON the opportunity of showing the attitude of our younger scholars to the great issue raised at Kikuyu. That attitude, so ably maintained in this article, will give heart again to many a preacher of the Gospel, and especially to many a preacher of the Gospel abroad.

There is a beautiful figure used in the Book of Deuteronomy to illustrate the fatherly love of God for Israel.

'As an eagle that stirreth up her nest,
That fluttereth over her young,
He spread abroad his wings, he took them,
He bare them on his pinions.'

So the Revised Version. The figure is most beautiful. But is it true?

Professor DRIVER could find no first-hand example. He quotes Dr. W. L. ALEXANDER, who quotes from Davy's *Salmonia*: 'Two parent eagles on Ben Weevis were teaching their offspring, two young birds, the manœuvres of flight.' Rising from the top of a mountain, they 'at first made small circles, and the young imitated them; they paused on their wings waiting till they had made their first flight, holding them on their expanded wings when they appeared exhausted, and then took a second and larger gyration, always rising towards the sun, and enlarging their circle of flight, so as to make a gradually ascending spiral.'

That is pertinent, but it is scarcely enough. Dr. J. P. PETERS felt that it is scarcely enough, and when at first he looked about to find other examples he was completely baffled. Writing in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1911, he said: 'Of the actual procedure of eagles, griffon vultures, or other similar birds in the earlier stages of teaching or helping their young to fly, described in the first two verses of the above quatrain, I am able to get no information from published works or from personal inquiry of the most distinguished ornithologists, whom I have in the last few months annoyed with many importunities.'

He found that certain smaller birds shouldered or jostled their young out of the nest and so compelled them to attempt to fly. 'They usually land on the ground as the result of the first attempt, whereupon the parent birds fly down to them, flap their wings and fly before them, as though showing them how to fly, rush at them and away from them, hover about them, sometimes hold food before them at a little distance, and in general scold and coax them to flight.' But he was by no means

42.391

sure that he could argue from these smaller birds to the conduct of the eagle or the griffon vulture.

Dr. PETERS was seeking to reach the meaning of one of the words which are used of the eagle in Deuteronomy. It is the word translated 'fluttereth.' He did not think that 'fluttereth' was the meaning. But he was baffled in his search. He could find no one who could tell him from actual experience what is the way of the eagle with her young. And for a time he gave the matter up.

In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1914 he returns to it. He has been making further inquiry. He wrote to Mr. HANAUER of Damascus for one. Mr. HANAUER replied: 'I have never seen either eagles or vultures "stirring up" their nests, or "carrying their young on their wings." I have, however, heard the late Bishop Gobat relate that when in Abyssinia, between the years 1829 and 1837, he had seen eagles assist their young in flight, by flying underneath them when the brood were beginning to try their wings, and seemed weary and about to drop. In this case the parent birds carried their young for a while till they had rested, and then let them start again by themselves. I have also the testimony of one of my sons, who takes a keen interest in such things, to the effect that he has seen ravens act towards their young in the same way.'

Dr. PETERS was not satisfied yet. It occurred to him that from the Rocky Mountains he might obtain some information as to the habits of eagles. He accordingly wrote to Bishop THOMAS of Wyoming, who sent a note to the missionaries in the mountain districts of that State, asking them if they could furnish any information as to the ways of the eagle with its young. This is the best of the answers that were returned: 'I have seen the young ones learning to fly several times. . . . When the young ones are full grown the old ones force them out of the nest. Then the young have to fly up on a near-by cliff before they will feed them, going higher with each trial, until after about a week the young are able to go to any place on the ridge. Then one of the old ones will take a bird or small animal and fly across the canyon, continuing to do this until the young follow. Then they will fly around, letting the young ones come nearly close enough to get their food. After that the young are with the old birds for about three weeks, then they are absent for about a week, the old ones returning alone.'

That is not altogether sufficient, but it was supplemented by the report of a missionary among the Shoshone Indians: 'An old white trapper informs me that the eagle pecks at and jostles its young (when old enough) out of the nest until they take to wing and fly to a near-by crag: then it repeats the same thing until the young one, driven by the old bird, soars away. An experienced half-breed trapper tells me that, when the young eagle attempts to fly, should it get into difficulties, the old bird will seize it with its talons and carry it back to the nest, and that sometimes, when the young one becomes exhausted during its first flight, the parent bird will fly beneath it and bear it up on its back.'

Dr. PETERS is content. 'Without going further,' he says, 'this testimony, it seems to me, is sufficient to prove that the passage Deut. 32^{11} is actually an eye-witness description, and that the process there described is as follows: The eagle (or griffon vulture) "stirs up" its nest, that is, it pushes, jostles, or in some way drives the young out; then, if the young does not fly, the eagle proceeds to entice it or to force it to do so, and the particular method described in this passage is the flying at the young with a violent down-rush flapping of the wings and the like. Then, if the young eagle, thus forced into flight, lose its courage or its strength, the old eagle flies under it and supports it with its pinions.'

But it was not to discover the meaning of this passage in Deuteronomy that Dr. PETERS set out

upon his search. It was to find out the meaning of a more important and scarcely less picturesque passage. He had come to believe that the translation of the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis is altogether wrong.

The translation is: 'And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' In the margin of the Revised Version the last clause is rendered, 'the spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters.' This is the usual interpretation. As Dr. SKINNER puts it: 'The Divine Spirit is figured as a bird brooding over its nest.'

But Dr. SKINNER sees that this idea of the brooding bird is quite out of relation to the rest of the narrative. And not only is it out of relation to the rest of this passage; it is also out of touch with the rest of Scripture. Nowhere else in all the Bible is this idea found in reference to the universe. The cosmogonic world-egg is a wholly pagan conception.

Dr. PETERS attacked the word translated 'brooding.' He found it, in the particular form used here, in only one other passage in Scripture, the passage already dealt with in Deuteronomy. There, he believed, it describes the process of getting the young to take to the wing. After he obtained the necessary information he was convinced that the meaning was far from 'brooding.' It was not rest but motion; not hovering or brooding, but fluttering or shaking or rushing. In Deuteronomy the meaning is that the bird rushes upon her young to drive them out of the nest. And the true translation of the passage in Genesis is that 'the wind of God (the Hebrew word being equally capable of the translation wind or spirit) rushed upon the face of the water.'

In the issue of *The Constructive Quarterly* for September there is an article by Professor Jean RIVIÈRE of the Grande Séminaire, Albi, France. Professor RIVIÈRE is a Roman Catholic. The subject of his article is the formula 'Outside the Church no salvation.' What does he do with such a subject in such a place?

He does not reject the formula. He maintains it both for himself and for his Church. He says, truly, that 'the Church affirms it in official documents and with perfect clearness.' Take the Fourth Lateran Council, the council of 1215. Against the Albigensians it was laid down by that council: 'There is but one Universal Church of the faithful, outside of which absolutely no one is saved.' Or take the decree for the Jacobites, which follows the Council of Florence. There we read, more particularly: 'The Sacrosanct Roman Church . . . firmly believes, professes and proclaims that none of those who are not in the Catholic Church—not only pagans, but also neither Jews, nor heretics, nor schismatics—can have any portion in eternal life . . . if they are not incorporated into it before the end of their life.'

And Professor RIVIÈRE has no difficulty in showing that this doctrine is in accordance with—not perhaps 'the most ancient Christian tradition,' as he says, but with tradition that goes back to the writings of Augustine. Preaching to the people of Cæsarea, Augustine said of the Donatist Bishop Emeritus: 'Outside the Catholic Church he can have everything except salvation. He can have the [episcopal] dignity, he can have the sacrament, he can chant *Alleluia*, he can answer *Amen*, he can read the Gospel, he can possess and preach the faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but nowhere except in the Catholic Church can he find salvation.' A council of Cirta (A.D. 412) declares in its Synodal letter, which Professor RIVIÈRE has no doubt was drawn up by the Bishop of Hippo: 'If anyone has separated himself from the Catholic Church, although he imagine himself to be thereafter leading an upright life, by that crime alone, which keeps him afar from the unity

of Christ, he shall not have life; but the wrath of God dwells in him.'

But Professor Rivière claims more than that this is the belief of the Church since Augustine, he claims that it is a doctrine of Scripture. St. Peter 'evokes the significant memory of Noah's ark.' St. Paul speaks of the wild slip grafted on the trunk of the olive, of the edifice built upon the sole foundation of Christ, and of the mystical body of which Christ is the head 'and we all ought to be members.' 'Is it necessary,' he asks, 'to say that a member which lives outside of the body is inconceivable, or a stone which keeps outside of the building?'

And not only does he find Apostolic witness for his formula, he finds authority for it in Christ. Observe the evidence. First he says, 'it was to His Apostles, united to Peter, their chief, that Christ entrusted the "keys of the Kingdom," which is the same as saying that men must receive the gift of Grace and of truth through their intermediation alone.' Next, he quotes the words, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved'; and adds: 'but evidently he alone.' Lastly he refers to Jesus as the Vine and as the Shepherd: 'To live and bear fruit, the shoot must remain united to the trunk'; and 'There is only one spiritual sheepfold, outside of which the poor souls are the prey of wolves; and it is of this fold that Jesus is the door.'

But Professor Rivière did not write this article in order to prove that the formula 'Outside the Church no salvation' is a dogma of the Church of Rome, or even that it is a doctrine of Scripture. Sending it to *The Constructive Quarterly*, he sent it, we may be sure, for conciliation. He acknowledges that, as commonly understood, it is an offence to those who do not belong to the Church of Rome. His purpose is to remove the offence. How does he accomplish it?

First of all he says that there is one great exception to the application of the formula. It was never intended by means of this dogma to exclude from the blessings of salvation the invincibly ignorant. 'The adversaries without who attack the adage, "Outside the Church no salvation," and the pusillanimous believers who are scandalized by it, are wrong to ignore or forget that it represents only one aspect of revelation, that is to say, a partial truth, and one which, like all truths, becomes an error as soon as we attempt to take it for a total truth. To have the Catholic teaching in its integrity we must say: Outside the Church no salvation, that is, for those who, having been on the way to know it, are morally responsible for not having entered it; but those who are in good faith ignorant of it receive outside of it the graces necessary for their salvation.'

This is a considerable exception, certainly. The adage, which has all the appearance of universality, proves to be of only limited application. For we must still admit, however sorrowfully, that they who are ignorant of the claims of the Church are many more than they who are aware of them. But this is not all. There is another great exception.

The dogma in question applies only to the Church as a whole; it does not apply to individuals. It is an official declaration; it does not touch private persons. It has reference to the whole human race, as a race; it has nothing to do with the persons who compose the race. Of course this explanation is not original to Professor Rivière; it is as old as Augustine. But he adopts it without hesitation, and applies it without flinching.

And if these great exceptions are not enough, Professor Rivière is prepared to offer yet another. Every man who has ever lived in a Christian country has breathed the atmosphere of the Christian Church, and that is enough to entitle him to be called a member of it. '"How many," he says, adopting the words of Professor Bainvel of the Catholic Institute of Paris, "How many, in fact,

live on the Church and by the Church, on the truth which it teaches and the grace of which it is the depository, without suspecting what they owe it?" Such, to begin with, is the case with the heretics and schismatics, kept by age-long prejudices in the bond of dissident sects. The Christ they venerate and the Gospel they meditate, have they not taken them from the Mother Church? And the sacraments they receive, are they not always, according to the beautiful doctrine of St. Augustine, the work of Christ and of His Church? "All the baptized are, so to speak, baptized Catholics. Thus baptized, the heretic or the schismatic, so long as he has not fallen short of his light, will continue to owe to the true Church the graces which God shall be pleased to give him on account of the teaching which he will receive."'

'Thus'—again quoting Père Bainvel—'thus,' he says, 'the more we go into the reality of things, the more we see attaching themselves to the Church souls who at first sight would seem to have nothing in common with it. We need only continue the induction to arrive in all truth at the conclusion that not only is the Church here below the only society of salvation, but also that, according to the providential order and manifest intentions of God, every soul that is saved belongs in some fashion to the Church and is not saved but by being connected with it.'

A Sage among the Prophets.

By the Rev. W. P. Paterson, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

'I turned about, and my heart *was set* to know, and to search out, and to seek wisdom, and the reason of *things*.' —Ec 7^{25a} (R.V.).

The Bible has not much to say about those interests and activities of the intellectual life which we comprehend under science and philosophy, and which have their modern symbol in a University. For one thing the Bible was given through a Semitic people, who were assigned a different task in the providential division of the labour of the spirit. The chief end of the Bible was to appeal to man as man, and to minister to those religious needs and moral aspirations which are the common stock both of cultured and uncultured humanity. At the same time there were those among the Biblical writers who shared and appreciated the purely intellectual impulse. As the band of the sacred writers represented every social grade, from that of the ruler of a people down to the peasant and the fisherman, so it included along with unlearned and ignorant men some who had felt that the pursuit of knowledge is one of the worthiest objects of human endeavour. And their intellectual interest was not suppressed, but only redirected and elevated, by their enlistment in the service of revelation. Among the New Testament writers this position is illustrated by St. Paul, who had zealously mastered all that was taught in the narrow school of the synagogue, and for whom it was one of the glories of the gospel that it threw a flood of fresh light upon the deepest problems of the world and of human life. He speaks slightingly, indeed, of the wisdom of this world, under which name he seems to comprehend summarily the intellectual achievements of classical antiquity; and he felt bound to pass this judgment in view of its failure in the supreme task of attaining a true and full knowledge of God and of His will. But the same Paul laid down the principle that 'all things are yours'—thereby putting in a Christian claim to everything that enriches and ennobles human life, while in mapping out the domain of the mind he bids it take possession of whatsoever things are true. The Old Testament contains a group of books known as the Wisdom Literature which is the product of criticism and reflexion working upon a comparative study of the data of revelation and experience. Among the writings thus described a special interest attaches for us to the Book of Ecclesiastes, since there is evidence that the author was a man who, at least during one phase of his career, had digged for knowledge

as for hid treasure, and who in the quest of truth had passed through an ordeal which has been somewhat closely reproduced in the conditions of our modern world.

It is the generally accepted verdict of criticism that King Solomon cannot have been the author of Ecclesiastes. The Hebrew style is shown to be that of the later age, and the ideas with which the writer is familiar bear the stamp of a period when Israel had been saturated by cosmopolitan influences. It also seems incredible that Solomon could have painted his administration in so dark colours, and confessed that his government was little better than a reign of injustice. The author is supposed to have been a Hebrew sage who lived either in the time of Alexander the Great, or over a century later when Palestine had been wrested from Egypt by the Seleucid dynasty of Syria. Dean Plumptre, who favours the later date, has given a plausible sketch of his biography, based on the internal evidence of the book. He conceives him as a Jew of Palestine, who had been instructed in his youth in the oracles of the Old Testament, and disciplined in the rigorous customs of Hebrew piety. From hence he made his way to Alexandria —now rising into fame as a seat of learning—in which the science and philosophy of Greece were assiduously cultivated and disseminated. Into this new world of knowledge he threw himself with youthful ardour. He learned what the natural philosophers had to teach about the heavenly bodies, rivers and seas, minerals and plants; and he sat at the feet of the moral philosophers as they discoursed of the cycles in human affairs, the chief good, and the golden mean. We may further imagine him as, his mind enlightened and his powers matured, he developed independence of thought, or when, in accordance with his self-chosen title of Koheleth or Debater, he joined in the discussions in which school clashed with school, and in which as iron sharpeneth iron so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend. Thereafter he may be supposed to have tried other experiences, and also to have made adventures in the sphere of action; and at the last to have written a book in which he garnered the wisdom that had been learned, reproduced the occasional moods of doubt and pessimism that had accompanied his pilgrimage, and ended where he began, by reasserting his invincible Jewish faith in a God who assuredly lives and reigns, even though clouds and thick darkness envelop His throne.

If, now, it was in such a situation—at the meeting-place of Hebrew piety and Hellenic culture—that this strange Book of Ecclesiastes had its origin, the author is a figure who had much in common with the youth of our own country who gather within the walls of a University. There is a correspondence in at least two particulars. In the first place our Scottish youth, like the Palestinian Jew, are the heirs of a past in which religion was a brightly shining light and a compelling power. They are sprung from a people which believed with all its mind in the same God who spake by the prophets of Israel, whose history was moulded and coloured by the same faith in His laws and promises, and whose heroic ages were times when men contended, at the cost of suffering and death, for ideal causes of truth and righteousness in the name of the same God. It may also be thought that like the Preacher we live in a period when the golden age of our religion lies in the past, when the voices of the prophets have for some time fallen silent, and when we do not yet see the clear and convincing signs of the approach of the next great spiritual period which may be expected from the use and wont of the working of God in history. But at least we have, like Koheleth, the great religious inheritance; and there are few of us who have not started with it in the spiritual equipment conveyed to us through the teaching of parents, or through the ministry of the Christian Church. The second point of the parallel is that the University career recalls the pilgrimage supposed to have been made by the Preacher to the Hellenic centre of Alexandria. The intellectual significance of the academic training is that those who are British by birth, and Christian by upbringing, are ushered into a world whose spirit, whose ideals and whose strivings are characteristically Greek rather than Hebraic. They may occupy themselves with the literature in which the classical spirit is enshrined, or they may pass on to other edifices of which the Greeks laid the foundations and on which the moderns have built—history which tries to see things as they were without concession to our prejudices and wishes, science which seeks to know the causes of things and the manner of their becoming, philosophy which explores the mechanism of the human mind, investigates the nature of the good

and the beautiful, and tries its unaided strength upon the ultimate problems of the universe. And for us, as for the Preacher, the supreme problem of our culture is to combine without loss into a grander whole the diverse elements that come to us with the hall-mark of Greece and of Palestine.

It would appear, then, that the Preacher was in a position to speak with good credentials to those who combine a religious inheritance with an intellectual vocation; and we shall proceed to set forth the chief heads of his intellectual and his religious message.

I.

The Intellectual Message.

This may be summarized by saying that learning is an invaluable possession, but that the pursuit of it is attended by serious drawbacks and dangers. His estimate, in fact, takes the form of a profit-and-loss account.

1. That wisdom is a priceless boon he affirms in emphatic terms. He observes that it excelleth folly—which, no doubt, includes ignorance, as far as light excelleth darkness. He gives two reasons in support of this judgment. One is that knowledge is power. 'Wisdom is a strength to the wise more than ten rulers which are in a city.'[1] It is a power which can sometimes accomplish as much even as money. 'Wisdom is a defence, even as money is a defence.'[2] And sometimes it brings safety when all other resources fail. 'There was a little city, and few men within it; and there came a great king against it; and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it: now there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city.'[3] What he had chiefly in view in these sayings was doubtless the knowledge of the properties of things which gives man dominion over nature, with skill and ingenuity in applying this knowledge for protection against danger and the promotion of material well-being. He gives another reason for affirming the excellence of knowledge which shows that he had also other kinds of wisdom in view than that which, as in the case of the wise man who delivered a city, produced palpable material results. In at least two of his reflexions he may rather have in mind those intellectual pursuits which are of little practical utility—such as the lore of the grammarian, the visions of the poets, the meditations of the philosophers on the ultimate nature of things and the meaning of human life. He knows of a wisdom which, if it do no more, at least yields a large inward profit to those who possess it. It is the sovereign virtue of wisdom that 'it giveth life to them that have it.'[4] It effects an enrichment and refinement of soul which is even mirrored in the face. This is in fact the substance of what is urged in modern controversies in justification of those literary and philosophical studies which seem to have no practical value for society, and are not very obviously useful as an aid to success in life. When the Preacher said that 'wisdom maketh the face to shine,'[5] he said the same thing, only that he said it more picturesquely, which Mr. Matthew Arnold expressed in his famous proposition that 'culture augments the excellence of our nature, and renders our intelligent being still more intelligent.' It is the same doctrine which Sir William Hamilton inculcated in his eloquent introductory lecture to Metaphysics in which he claimed for the discipline of philosophy 'the function of cultivating the mind by supplying to its higher faculties the occasion of their most vigorous and therefore most improving exercise.' To the same effect Cardinal Newman writes of the inward change which impressed the Preacher in its effect of the transfigured countenance. 'It is well to be a gentleman,' he says in his defence of the higher learning, 'it is well to have a cultivated intellect, a delicate taste, a candid, equitable, dispassionate mind, a noble and courteous bearing in the conduct of life, and those, the collateral qualities of a large knowledge, are the primary objects of a University.'

2. On the other hand we find scattered throughout the book a number of reflexions on the disadvantages and disappointments which attend the pursuit of wisdom. One is the painfulness of the student's life. 'In much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.'[6] Was the Preacher thinking of the new burdens that had been laid on his spirit as with widening knowledge he realized the prevalence of suffering in the world, and the vanity of human ambitions? Was he recalling the inward peace which he enjoyed in the sheltered conditions of his early life, and which he imperilled when he exposed himself to the chaotic influences of the wider world? Or was he only thinking of the brain-weariness, the laborious days, the unrestful

[1] 7^{19}. [2] 7^{12}. [3] $9^{14.15}$. [4] 7^{12}. [5] 8^{1}. [6] 1^{18}.

nights, to which he elsewhere makes reference, and doubting whether the gains had been proportionate to the sacrifice? Again, he is sure that much of the labour is wasted effort, since all is a rediscovery of what was known before—'there is no new thing under the sun.'[1] Further, he complains that the wise do not receive their due recompense. 'I returned, and saw under the sun, that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill.'[2] Nor do they receive their meed of honour. The poor, wise man who delivered the city was spoken of for a day, but afterward no one remembered that same poor man. And finally, to omit lesser considerations, death appears upon the scene, scatters to the winds the hard-earned gains, and reduces the sage to the same level as the fool. 'As it happeneth to the fool, so will it happen even to me; and why was I then more wise?' 'How doth the wise man die even as the fool!'[3] Was the labour worth while?

It is true that the debit side of his account has to be revised in the circumstances and with the outlook of our later age. One of the privileges and glories of these later days is that there is so much which is new under the sun and in the regions beyond the sun. To-day the poor wise man who does anything so considerable as save a city can depend on substantial rewards both in wealth and honour. And as for the crushing argument from the inevitable spoliation by death, the situation has been changed by the gospel which brought life and immortality to light, and the scholar's unceasing toil seems more reasonable in the prospect of the possibilities of eternity.

'Others mistrust and say, "But time escapes
Live now or never!"
He said, "What's time? leave Now for dogs and apes!
Man has for ever."'

While, however, corrections have to be made for latter-day conditions, there are two of the reflexions which are of permanent relevancy and weight. One is that it behoves those who devote themselves to the learned life to take full stock of the tremendous obligations, and to count the cost. The other is that the intellectual life is not of itself sufficient to satisfy the deepest needs of the human soul. But with this last observation we make the transition to the religious aspect of the teaching of Ecclesiastes.

[1] 1^{9}. [2] 9^{11}. [3] $2^{15.16}$.

II.

The Religious Message.

On a superficial view it might appear that the Preacher has no religious message—that he is a seeker after truth, not the apostle of an assured creed, that he is like unto a merchantman seeking goodly pearls, but who so far has had little success in his quest. Yet we may be sure that there was some good reason why the author of Ecclesiastes, though he sometimes uses the language of a sceptic, and oftener that of a worldling, was associated with the goodly fellowship of believers and saints in the sacred library of the Old Testament. Part of the explanation is that he rendered a service to religion on the negative side by setting aside the claims of any earthly object to be accepted as the chief end of man. He mentions the chief blessings which are coveted by the mass of mankind—pleasure, wealth, power; and he declares that it is not in them, even if our hold on them were permanent—as it is not—to fill the soul with an enduring satisfaction and tranquillity. Nor again is the chief good for man to be found, where it may be sought by nobler spirits, in the achievements and possessions of the intellectual life: this also, notwithstanding its greater dignity and its higher utility, must leave a man, if he have nothing more, with a sense of emptiness and at discord with himself. 'Of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness to the flesh.'[4] Human life needs to be filled up and rounded off with a higher and more comprehensive good.

To this discovery of the Preacher there is an interesting parallel in one of the frankest of modern autobiographies. To those of the last generation the man who stood out as the most prominent representative of sheer mental power and mental avidity was perhaps John Stuart Mill. It had been his father's ambition to develop the precocious mind into a magnificent intellectual machine, and he succeeded in this part of the task. But the son, when he became a man, and his initial curiosity had been partially satisfied, was conscious that something vital had been omitted from his training and experience. 'I put the question to myself,'

[4] 12^{12}.

he says, 'suppose that all your objects in life were realized, would this be a great joy and happiness to you? And an irrepressible self-consciousness distinctly answered, "No." At this my heart sank. All my happiness was to have been sought in the continual pursuit of this end. The end had ceased to charm, and how could there ever again be any interest in the means. I seemed to have nothing left to live for.' When we encounter him thirty years later, we find a presence with him which has created for him a different world. 'Since my wife's death,' he says, 'I have sought for such alleviation as my state permitted of, by the mode of life which enabled me to feel her still near me. I bought a cottage as close as possible to the place where she was buried, and there I lived during a great portion of the year. My objects in life are solely those which were hers, my pursuits those in which she shared, or with which she sympathized. The memory is to me a religion, and her approbation the standard by which, summing up as it does all worthiness, I endeavour to regulate my life.' The need being thus conceded of a religion—of a personal relationship that will enrich the life with guidance and protection, and fill the heart with settled peace—it may well be thought that a better religion is available than that of the modern philosopher who pitched his tent beside his dead wife's grave, and tried evermore to see her gracious face limned upon the encompassing darkness.

To return to the Preacher, he not only felt the need of a religion, but possessed one which had elements of truth, of purity, and even of moral grandeur. He ever writes as if all serious thinking about human life must take God for one of its axioms. He also profoundly believes in God as the power manifested in the world, the author of the constitution and course of nature, the being upon whom all creatures depend for their existence and preservation, and for the diverse conditions and appointments of their lot. His attitude toward God is marked by the deepest reverence. In presence of the supreme reality he feels that speech is presumption. 'God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few.'[1] He despises the superstition of the readers of dreams; he warns against the offering of the sacrifices of fools, and he feels that the true service of God is the fear of the Lord which constrains man to depart from evil. He has been charged with scepticism, but his scepticism chiefly meant that he did not profess to know the Almighty as fully as others professed to know Him; and especially that he did not pretend to understand the doings of God in the detailed arrangements of this strange and confused world. He could not undertake to justify the ways of God to man. But he was clear that God and duty are the assured realities on which we must build our lives, and that we may make a confident venture of faith that 'it shall be well with them that fear God, but it shall not be well with the wicked.'[2] And so his book ends with words which I feel sure are no interpolation, but the instinctive reiteration of the fundamental article of the creed of his fathers—'Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgement, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.'[3]

We who live after Christ have a richer, a deeper, a more comforting, a better-grounded creed. From the deeps of the being of the Almighty and All-wise God, the region where the Preacher bowed in awe before the inscrutable, there has shined upon us the revelation of a God of love in the face of Jesus Christ. While he thought of man as doing his best out of his own resources to meet the requirements of God, and standing or falling by his independent performance, we believe in a God who draws near to us in grace, who has compassion on our weakness, who dwells in us by the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and who Himself enables us, if we trust His mercy and His power, to attain to what He would have us to be, and to do according to the law and pattern of Christ. We have also a more sure word of prophecy illuminating the world that lies behind the veil. But there are still lessons for many of us in the message of this sage of the twilight. He is an early and a very interesting witness to the truth, which many in our time need to learn anew, that art and science and letters are no substitute for religion. Moreover, those of us who are rooted in the Christian faith may also learn of him that God is greater than our widest and deepest thoughts; that though He has made known to us what it chiefly concerns us to know, there remain mysteries and enigmas enough in the

[1] 5^{2}.

[2] $8^{12.\ 13}$.

[3] $12^{13.\ 14}$.

providential order; and that it is our duty, even when we cannot understand, to bow in humility and trust before the unsearchable will. And not least may we learn from the book and its context that if we are faithful to the light which we have it will shine to more and more; and that he who shows the fear of God in a life consecrated to the highest that he knows may hope in the end to find deliverance from all his bewilderment of mind and travail of soul.

Literature.

RELIGION AND ART.

In a handsome and outstanding volume Mr. Fisher Unwin has published an English translation of the *Religione e arte figurata* of Alessandro Della Seta, Professor of Archæology in the University of Genoa. The translation, a good one, is made by Marion C. Harrison. The English title is *Religion and Art*: A Study in the Evolution of Sculpture, Painting and Architecture (21s. net).

Professor Della Seta, as Mrs. Arthur Strong tells us in the valuable Introduction which she has contributed to the English edition, 'traces the rise of art from magical and ritual observances, and leads us on to behold its liberation from the yoke of magic, first by the influence of the Greek spirit, and later by the still more potent influence of Christianity.' And she gives it as her opinion that 'never, since the application of scientific methods to the criticism of art, have conclusions, whether as to the origins or the ultimate fate of art, been applied within so wide an area of phenomena.' The book begins with the epoch of the mammoth and the reindeer, and traverses the vast spaces that lead from the magical carvings and paintings of Bruniquel or Altamira to the Renaissance and modern times.

'Della Seta incisively sets forth and analyses the differences between the art of Egypt, of Babylon and of Assyria, and of the Kreto-Myceneans, and shows why each race in turn—even the rich Minoan civilization that contained in germ so much that went to make the greatness of Greek art—failed to throw off the tyranny of magic. Among the Eastern peoples a tendency to symbolism was to a certain extent the obstacle to development, since symbolism checks the growth of the mythopœic spirit—of that power to reflect about the relations and the acts of divine beings which was to prove the liberator of art. The Jews alone stood from the first outside the magic circle, but a Judaic figured art was made impossible by an over-exalted monotheism which raised the divinity too far above the sphere of man and resulted in a horror of images. Thus the incomparable historical material of the Bible found no expression in art before the advent of Christianity. But Christianity, by bringing the divinity down to earth and making this divinity a subject for art, enabled monotheism to take the step which the Hebraic conception of religion had made impossible.'

The volume is eminently readable. In this respect Italian philosophical and scientific writers are a welcome relief from much reading in German, and often rival the best French expositors. But Professor Della Seta surpasses the philosopher and scientist in clearness and vigour, just as he possesses a more manageable material to work with. The volume is not only readable, it is fascinating. For to the style is added the zest of originality of view and a young man's intense earnestness of propagandism.

Among matters to which Mrs. Strong draws attention may be named as of particular interest these two: First, Della Seta's insistence on the originality of the earliest Christian art. Even for the paintings in the Catacombs—which have been treated with such contempt by students both of pagan and of later mediæval art—he claims and vindicates a vivid originality. The poverty of form, so striking to those who came to Christian art from the crowded figures of the reliefs of the later Roman Empire, is, Della Seta maintains, not necessarily a proof of artistic incapacity, but the result of conscious rejection of everything superfluous or unnecessary to ideas which seek expression in a direct and simple symbolism.

The other matter to which attention should be

directed is more fundamental. It is the marvellous way in which Della Seta shows how Religion and Art have progressed or decayed together throughout the history of the world. Speaking of this, which may be called the subject of the book, and *is* so called by the English editor, Mrs. Strong says: 'No such weighty pronouncement on the connection between art and religion as this of Della Seta's has appeared of late years, if we except the masterly article on Greek Religion contributed to Hastings's Encyclopædia, in which Dr. Farnell formulated the direct and vital influence of Greek religion upon Greek art.'

THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

A History of Philosophy has been written by Dr. Frank Thilly, Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University, and has been published by Messrs. G. Bell & Sons in one quite convenient volume, although it runs to over six hundred pages (10s. 6d. net).

What is a History of Philosophy? As we answer our questions we shall follow Professor Thilly's own method. His method is to let the authors of the different systems of philosophy present their ideas without extensive criticism on his part. We shall let Professor Thilly present his ideas so. And to our first question the answer is: 'The history of philosophy aims to give a connected account of the different attempts which have been made to solve the problem of existence or to render intelligible to us our world of experience. It is the story of the development of reasoned human thought from its earliest beginnings down to the present time; not a mere chronological enumeration and exposition of philosophical theories, but a study of these in their relation to one another, the times in which they are produced, and the thinkers by whom they are offered.'

Why then should we study the history of philosophy? The answer is: 'Intelligent persons are interested in the fundamental problems of existence and in the answers which the human race has sought to find for them on the various stages of civilization. Besides, such a study helps men to understand their own and other times; it throws light on the ethical, religious, political, legal, and economic conceptions of the past and the present, by revealing the underlying principles on which these are based. It likewise serves as a useful preparation for philosophical speculation; passing, as it does, from the simpler to the more complex and difficult constructions of thought, it reviews the philosophical experience of the race and trains the mind in abstract thinking. In this way we are aided in working out our own views of the world and of life.'

Dr. Thilly does not include all philosophy within his six hundred octavo pages. He confines himself to the philosophy of the West. He omits the philosophy of all Oriental peoples, whether Hindus, Egyptians, Chinese, or any other, because the theories of these peoples consist, in the main, of mythological and ethical doctrines, and are not thoroughgoing systems of thought: they are shot through with poetry and faith. Accordingly he begins with the philosophy of the Greeks, which he divides into the Philosophy of Nature, Problems of Knowledge and Conduct, the Age of Reconstruction, the Ethical Movement, and the Religious Movement. There ends the Ancient Philosophy, for the book is divided as usual into the three parts of Ancient, Medieval, and Modern.

Professor Thilly has made a great effort to do justice to every thinker and every system, and to keep his own likes and dislikes out of sight. He has a strong grasp of the whole field, and maintains proportion in describing each separate system with wonderful success. And then he writes with ease, taking the English language and making it the pliant instrument of his will. His book will be placed between the elementary and the advanced histories of philosophy, and just there is there room for a new History of Philosophy.

THE ROMANCE OF PREACHING.

The Romance of Preaching (James Clarke & Co.; 5s. net)—that is surely a courageous title to take? It is the title taken by the late C. Silvester Horne, M.A. and M.P., for his Yale Lectures. The Romance of Preaching is the subject of the last lecture. And to show us that he means it, and that he knows what he speaks of, he gives a history of preaching in the past. That history occupies the first seven lectures. It is when he comes to the last lecture and to our own day, the preaching of these dull days (for he spoke and ended before the war began), that Mr. Horne speaks of the Romance of Preaching.

Wherein does he find its Romance? First in this, that '*preaching can never lose its place so long as the mystery and wonder of the human spirit remain.* For we are dealing with that which is the source of all the amazing interest of life. Man is a creature mystically elect to strange conflicts and adventures of mind and soul. He stands alone in God's august creation, in that he knows the exaltation of spiritual vision and the humiliation of remorse for sin. He has inexplicable beatitudes, and as inexplicable sorrows. His mysterious history is blood-stained and tragic, but it is lighted everywhere with almost incredible heroism.'

Next he finds the Romance of Preaching in this, that '*amid all changes of thought and phrase the wonder of conversion remains*, to be the supreme joy and glory of the preacher. A congregation gathered in the name of Christ, and prepared by prayer for that message which is the supreme call to life, is to me a momentous assembly. It is the arena where God and Self fight out stupendous duels. It furnishes an atmosphere in which anything may happen. At any moment Saul may come to his crisis and the new Paul be born. For our Gospel is not the survival of the fit, but the revival of the unfit. And here in the society of Christ those Divine forces are leagued and focused which decide the destinies of individuals and even of nations. Within that congregation men are being braced up for big renunciations and sacrificial enterprises. The voice from the pulpit is the ally of the trembling and even fainting soul that is at the point of giving up the battle for virtue and righteousness.'

Again, he finds the Romance of Preaching in this, that '*we are manifestly on the eve of new applications of Christ's teaching, which will revive the interest of the people in Christianity to a surprising degree.* One of the most remarkable features in the history of Christian progress during the past few years has been the creation of a new organization of a very simple character called the 'Brotherhood Movement.' It has attracted to itself hundreds of thousands of men; and the secret of its attraction is twofold. Firstly, it presents for their acceptance a very simple faith; and secondly, it brings them to close quarters with certain giant social evils which we of the Churches have ignored too long.'

And lastly, he finds the Romance of Preaching in this, that '*over this world of military camps, bristling frontiers and armoured fleets, there is being heard to-day with new insistence the ever-romantic strains of the angels' song of Peace and Goodwill.* The Gospel has a twofold mission. It is ours to break down the barriers between man and God, and it is ours to break down the barriers between man and man. Nobody can calculate the effect on the life of this world, if every minister of Christ were to know himself charged with full authority as an ambassador of peace, and were to make it a definite part of his mission to plead the cause of brotherhood with all other peoples. No governments could resist such concerted appeal.'

He spoke, we say, before the war. Did he not also speak after it? Was it not as a modern prophet that he spoke? Three days after he uttered that prophecy he had entered the presence of the Master.

THE EVOLUTION OF A MISSIONARY.

The Evolution of a Missionary is the title given to the biography of the Rev. John Hyde DeForest, for thirty-seven years Missionary of the American Board, in Japan. The biography is written by the missionary's daughter, Miss Charlotte B. DeForest (Revell; 5s. net).

In an Introduction to the book Professor Harlan P. Beach says: 'Among some hundreds of missionary biographies with which the present writer is acquainted, he does not recall one which so happily describes the modern apostolic life. Nor does he recall a single volume which is so full of instruction to the prospective missionary to advanced peoples.' That is good heartening for the reader; and it is deserved. Let it be said at once that this missionary is worthy of a biography and that it has been written worthily of him.

The title is well chosen. Mr. DeForest developed as a missionary. In the beginning he had great difficulty with the language, but he was a student and he had determination. He became quite learned at the last, not only in the language of the Japanese, but also in their history and religion. And as he learned he evolved. The day came when he had to face the problem of the inspiration of Scripture, a problem that has borne so hard upon the missionary of our day in every land. He faced it by study and prayer. Gradually light broke. He expresses his mind in this

way: 'Our fathers modified their ideas of God and the Bible, and based their creeds and theologies on their growing knowledge and their larger environment; and their God was all the more a living God to them, and their Bible all the better for the enlarged interpretation they reverently made. In like manner our environment has vastly increased, bringing immense treasures of new knowledge, and we should not be true to the spirit of our fathers unless we were ready, in the face of new facts, to change our ideas about God, about the Bible, about the world, and about our inherited creeds and theologies.'

But he was in no hurry to preach his new conception of inspiration. He waited until the new knowledge was transmuted into spiritual experience. Even then he did not preach Biblical criticism to Japanese audiences, although his sermons were filled with the new life that had come to his own spirit through its study; but in Karuizawa, that summer centre of refreshment and invigoration for Westerners in Japan, when asked to preach to his fellow-missionaries, he uttered his conviction on this matter by speaking on 'The Missionary's Need of Knowledge.' He pointed to the experience of the race and the individual in the acquisition of knowledge through the two parallel lines of God's revelation and man's discovery; and urged the equal necessity of both means to those who were called to Christian work in Japan. He felt that too conservative a stand on the part of some missionaries, in view of the new knowledge of the Bible, was a positive hindrance to Christianity in Japan, because it tended to produce a permanent dislike of the Bible on the part of Japanese thinkers.

Upon the new attitude to the Bible there soon came a new attitude to Religion. He said in late life to an audience in America: 'As I look back over the first half of my career, I confess I was not able to meet in a fair and courteous spirit the fierce attacks on Christianity by able men. What did I know about Buddhism and the life of its great founder?—or Confucianism and the mighty moral work it had wrought through long millenniums in the most populous empire on earth? Therefore I had to study, and learn with open mind all the good I could discover in those systems; and this is one of the greatest blessings my life in the East has brought me. I had to see what my own Bible has always taught, but what I had failed to discover—the universality of the light that lighteth every man coming into the world, east or west, and the universality of the Fatherhood of God.'

And his preaching was not only with new joy, but also with new power. We can judge by its fruits. One example is enough.

'A young physician married into a family where the members had all become Christian. He therefore became a Christian, and made his house a preaching-place. Shortly after the marriage, to the grief and horror of the bride, it appeared that her husband had the dreaded disease of leprosy. She fled back to her own home, saying she could never live as the wife of a leper. But her elder brother said to her, "You are now a Christian. He is a Christian. It is hard, but if Christ has laid this burden on you, is it right to run away from it?"

'That brought out her splendid spirit of sacrifice, and she and Christ went back to her stricken husband. And for fifteen years, while I never saw so repulsive and terrible a case of leprosy, that devoted wife, ever smiling and joyous, stayed by her husband's side, his blessed comfort until the day of his release. She made, in spite of shocking conditions, a real little Kingdom of Heaven in her home.'

The New York publishers known as the Abingdon Press have undertaken a 'Bible Study Textbook Series.' We need not be surprised that a new book, or even a new series of books, is appearing, the sole object of which is to encourage the study of the English Bible. For, in America at any rate, the study of the English Bible has lately been outstripping all other studies. Associations and guilds and clubs and councils innumerable have been formed for the encouragement of the study of the Bible. It is under the direction of certain of these associations or committees that this series has been projected. One feature of the series must be made prominent. It is the determination of its projectors that none of the volumes shall stand between the student and the Bible itself. To get the good of any volume, the Bible must be studied along with it, and questions are asked of the student at the end of each chapter.

Two volumes have already been published—*The Bible as Literature* ($1.50), by Irving Francis

Wood, Ph.D., and Elihu Grant, Ph.D., both professors in Smith College; and *New Testament History* ($1.50), by Harris Franklin Rall, Ph.D., President of the Iliff School of Theology in Denver, Colorado. In dealing with the Bible as literature the authors of the first volume distinguish Biblical literature from Biblical history or theology. But we do not need to have the idea explained now; we are familiar with it from Driver's *Introduction*. And it may be said at once that the authors of this volume owe not a little to Driver, whose critical standpoint is that which they adopt.

The other volume might be described as an introduction to the New Testament, but it is occupied much more with history than with literature or theology. It is indeed what it is called in the sub-title 'A Study of the Beginnings of Christianity.' Both volumes are distinguished by scholarship and sanity; both are valuable contributions to their subject, and must not be overlooked.

Excellent names are associated with the study of Eugenics. Yet the study of Eugenics is at the present moment somewhat in disrepute. Professor H. W. Conn gives two reasons; one that the teaching of Eugenics leads to hopelessness and pessimism, the other that it inevitably makes us neglect other phases of the inheritance question. Professor Conn has written a book on *Social Heredity and Social Evolution* (Abingdon Press; $1.50), for the express purpose of counteracting the second of these tendencies. He believes that the student of Eugenics has made a capital mistake in assuming that the laws which govern the development of mankind are identical with the laws which direct the evolution of other animals. He accordingly proposes to show that the laws of the evolution of animals and plants apply to human evolution only up to a certain point, beyond which man has been under the influence of distinct laws of his own. These distinct laws are due to the fact that man is social. This social fact has introduced a new set of forces which have had enormous influence in his special development. To these forces Professor Conn gives the general name of Social Heredity. He defines social heredity as 'simply the handing from generation to generation of the accumulations that have been heaped up by the past, wholly outside of the innate nature of the individual.' We are not sure that Professor Conn's clear sense of the one-sidedness of Eugenics has not driven him a little too far to the other side. For a complete conception of the subject of heredity, one should study a good book on Eugenics along with this book.

An extraordinary case of sudden restoration to health from the very door of the grave was reported in the newspapers of February 20, 1912, and some following days, especially in the *Evening News* of February 20 and the *Daily Chronicle* of February 21. The whole story may now be read in a small book entitled *The Living Touch*, by Dorothy Kerin (Bell; 2s. 6d. net). In this book Miss Kerin gives a sketch of her life leading up to the time when her health gave way, and then describes fully her illness and sudden and complete recovery. The doctor who attended her is quoted as saying she had suffered enough to kill half a dozen people. In attending her he said he had found all the gravest symptoms of advanced tuberculosis, of diabetes, and other complications. She had been attended, under him, by twelve nurses up to the present, and a chart was kept of her temperature. This chart shows that her temperature rose and fell in the most alarming way—sometimes reaching as high as 105°.

The testimony is also quoted of Dr. R. Julyan George of Paignton, who says: 'Having attended Miss Dorothy Kerin, I can testify to the serious nature of her illnesses, and to the fact that her recovery in each case was sudden and unusual. When I was first called in, on September 1, I found her in a semi-conscious state, and was told that she had been the victim of a violent assault. Examination showed fractured base of the skull and probable rupture of the drum of the left ear, with deafness on that side. Profuse hæmorrhage from nose and ear soon set in, and her condition was such as to cause considerable anxiety. On the evening of September 11, I received an urgent summons, and found the patient with a very high temperature and rapid pulse. Soon after my arrival, however, she went into what appeared to be a state of ecstasy, and when she came to herself she told us she had seen a vision. She said to me, "Did you see Him? He came and put His hand on my head, and I am cool, cool all over me. He promised to come again." I then took the temperature, and found it had dropped in a few minutes from 104° to 99°; the pulse had also

fallen from 162 to 100. In spite of this experience she still remained in a very serious condition, with increasing weakness and constant hæmorrhage, but less pain in the head. In addition, symptoms of acute appendicitis appeared, and my diagnosis being confirmed by Dr. C. Hyde Cosens, arrangements were made for Miss Kerin's removal to a Nursing Home, should an operation be necessary. On September 30, when I saw her early, she was quite deaf in both ears, and I was obliged to write on a piece of paper, "It is an attack affecting your hearing. You must remember His promise. He *will* come again." I was afraid of further developments and promised to return shortly. Returning two hours later, I found her fully dressed, and to all appearances perfectly well. Again she said she had seen a vision and been healed.'

There are other testimonies in the book, of nurses and of friends—as well as a minute account of the illness and recovery by Miss Kerin's mother.

This case is the more interesting that the prayer was silent and rather the expression of faith than petition for recovery. After being restored to health Miss Kerin prayed very earnestly that God would show her what He had brought her back to do. She says, 'I prayed much that God might guide me and point the way of ministration, and it has been shown me that the gifts of God can only be received through prayer. We shall find spiritual joy, or soul-health, through communion with God, and bodily health will follow as growth follows rain and sunshine.'

Messrs. A. & C. Black have projected a new series to be called the 'Social Workers Series.' Its editor is Mr. William Foss, late General Secretary of the Bradford City Guild of Help. Mr. Foss is also joint-author, along with Mr. Julius West, of the first volume of the series, of which the title is *The Social Worker and Modern Charity* (2s. 6d. net). Other volumes announced as in preparation are *Employment*, by Frederick Keeling; *The Sex Morality of the Poor*, by William Foss; and *Trade Unionism*, by H. M. Lloyd. Every volume is to be written by one who is actually engaged in the work with which it deals. Much use is made of statistics, and rightly; but the statistics are checked at every turn by the authors' own experience. The purpose is to guide those who have to take their share in the social work of our time, in order that their mistakes may be as few and as harmless as possible. If the authors succeed with the subject of modern charity, no author need fear to fail with any of the subjects that are to follow.

Round the title of *The Making of a Minister* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net), the Rev. T. S. Cairncross, B.D., has gathered his ideas of what a minister is, ought to be, has to do, and does. It is all interspersed with anecdotes. Sometimes there is the suspicion that the anecdote is there first and the writing its attendant, just as books on Palestine are sometimes written round a fine set of photographs. But the moment we are about to say 'Flippant,' Mr. Cairncross recalls us by a searching word or solemn warning. There is no doubt that the minister who is made after this model will be a humorist, but he will still be a minister.

Mr. Walter A. Mursell has written a truly charming book on books, and has published it under the title of *Byways in Bookland* (Gay & Hancock; 3s. 6d. net). If Mr. Mursell was born a bookworm, and he confesses that he was, this book which he has written is enough to redeem the word 'bookworm' from all its contempt. There is not one of those who will read it but will wish that he had been born a bookworm to have such delights as these.

Three times, Mr. Mursell says, he has felt the authentic thrill of inspiration, and each time it was when some great book came first into his hands. 'The first was a thrill of surprise. It came in *Robinson Crusoe*, at the moment when Crusoe comes suddenly upon the footprint in the sand. I remember how, on reading that, my boy's heart stood still a second and then began thumping like a sledge-hammer. It was not reading, it was adventure. I was actually there. For the time being I too was clothed in goat-skins, and was scouring my island with interest and wonder. Hitherto I had fondly imagined myself to be alone, and the discovery of this naked footprint struck a chill to my marrow and filled my mind with the gloomiest forebodings. Of course, it could only mean savages; there was no doubt about that. And that could only mean—well, there are some things upon which it is better not to dwell. Enough to remark that somebody would probably enjoy a good and cheap repast; but not I. The

second was a thrill of fear. It occurred in *Treasure Island*, when I heard the tap-tap-tap of Blind Pew's stick along the lonely frozen road. It was a weird, sinister, diabolical business. A more ghostly effect, or one more nicely calculated to strike panic into a boy's veins, could not have been created. At that awful juncture a kind of paralysis seized me. I wanted to throw down the book and leap to my feet, but I was congealed in my chair, "distilled almost to a jelly with the act of fear." It was like the fatal fascination of the serpent's eye. That horrible blind man with the iron grip was coming; I could hear the thud of his groping staff growing louder every moment; I wanted to arise and flee, and all I could do was to clutch the arms of my chair in stricken desperation. It was a kind of mental vertigo. Even now, when I read the passage, the vividness of my feelings on that first perusal recurs to me, and I cannot help lingering over the grisly page like an epicure over a favourite dish. The third was a thrill of beauty. It lies hid in the immortal passage from *Lavengro*. "Life is sweet, brother." "Do you think so?" "Think so!—There's night and day, brother, both sweet things; sun, moon, and stars, brother, all sweet things; there's likewise a wind on the heath. Life is very sweet, brother; who would wish to die?" . . . "In sickness, Jasper?" "There's the moon and the stars, brother." "In blindness, Jasper?" "There's the wind on the heath, brother." The words come into the narrative so unexpectedly. The scholar-gipsy comes suddenly upon a man sitting on the heath. It is his old acquaintance, Jasper Petulengro. Then ensues the brief dramatic dialogue, of which the above forms a part. I recollect that when I first read the passage I laid the book down, closed my eyes, and repeated the words over and over in a kind of ecstasy. The effect was indescribable. Yet even now I cannot tell what it is in the passage that is so affecting. One might doubtless analyse it, but I refuse to make the attempt. One can only dissect the dead, and this palpitates with life. It is the stuff of which poetry is made, as beautiful and elusive as the will-o'-the-wisp. Imagination claims it for its own.'

The anonymous author of *The Value of Fear*: A Fragment of Autobiography (Heffer; 1s. net), has heard the saying that all sincere autobiography is interesting, and puts the saying to the proof. Well, we have read his fifty pages, and not without being moved. It is the story of scepticism, sin, remorse, conversion. And the point of it is that the conversion was the direct result of the remorse.

Dr. William Gunn, medical missionary of the United Free Church of Scotland, has in his book *The Gospel in Futuna* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) given a complete account of the characteristics, customs, beliefs, and morals of the inhabitants of the island of Futuna, and has been able to add chapters on other islands of the New Hebrides. And all this he has done, not as a dry analyst, but as a sympathetic historian. Towards the end of the volume Dr. Gunn describes certain customs which illustrate Scripture texts. Here is one of them by way of example.

'Jg 7^5: "And the Lord said unto Gideon, Every one that lappeth of the water with his tongue as a dog lappeth, him shalt thou set by himself, likewise every one that boweth down upon his knees to drink." This lapping of the water like a dog by Gideon's army was unintelligible to me until I came to the New Hebrides. Standing one day by a stream I heard a noise behind me like a dog lapping water. I turned and saw a woman bowing down and throwing the water rapidly into her mouth with her hand. This satisfactorily explained the action of Gideon's men. It showed care and watchfulness; for they could walk along the stream "lapping" the water as they went; and an enemy was less likely to take them unawares than if they bent on their knees to drink. Most of the natives, however, bend down and touch the water with their lips as the rejected men of Gideon's army did.'

The Rev. William Mansfield Groton, S.T.D., Dean of the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, having made a careful study of the connexion between *The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults*, chose that subject for the Bohlen Lectures of 1913 (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). The book is much more a book than lectures usually allow. Yet it has all the ease and interest of the successful lecture. No one would imagine, on reading its pleasant chapters, that the subject which it handles is as difficult to handle as any subject in Christian history or doctrine. And it is probable that for the first time the English reader will gain some clear conception

of the extent to which Early Christianity appropriated the pagan ceremonies with which the Christian community was familiar. Professor Groton believes that the appropriation was limited and unessential. But he is by no means over-anxious to prove it so. He appreciates the arguments in favour of a large appropriation and answers them calmly. The impression he leaves is distinctly favourable to the originality of Christian ritual.

How rarely is a book which describes the life of the women of India a pleasant book! If it describes the life of Indian girls it is almost sure to be a book of utter pain and anguish. Beatrice M. Harband has written the story of a Hindu girl of high degree, telling of her life's struggles as maiden, wife, and widow. The book has been published under the title of *Jaya: Which Means Victory* (Marshall Brothers; 6s.). It is just as pitiful as we might have expected. It is not all pitiful, however; the author is too good an artist for that. Particularly attractive is the little maid Puchie, and altogether pleasant are some of the scenes in which she is introduced. That there is a day of deliverance at hand for the women of India we firmly believe; and this very book gives us the ground upon which to rest our belief. Jaya would have suffered less had she never heard of Christ. But we know that if we suffer with Him, we shall be also glorified with Him; and part of the glory is the service rendered in the cause of emancipation.

To those who doubt if we are making progress *in anything* offer the comparison between the earliest and the latest volumes of *The Sunday at Home* (R.T.S.; 7s. 6d.). The progress is manifest in the letterpress as surely as in the illustrations. The title of this magazine is appropriate. Every paper is good for Sunday reading at home; every illustration is homely. To name but one of the many excellent series of articles, what could be better reading for the Sunday at home than Mr. Harrington Lees' articles on 'Christ and the Home'?

The Religious Tract Society has published a most beautiful book of *Flower Pictures* drawn by Maude Angell, and the book has been edited by Flora Klickmann. Many of the pictures are in colour, wonderful reproductions of Maude Angell's paintings. Many more are drawings, either scattered throughout the margins or artistically printed on separate pages. For a Christmas present the R.T.S. will not do better than this.

A second edition has been issued by Messrs. Revell of *The Lord's Return*, seen in History and in Scripture as Pre-Millennial and Imminent, by Jesse Forest Silver (3s. 6d. net).

The aids to the teacher of the International Lessons are many, but none is more satisfactory than *Arnold's Practical Sabbath School Commentary*. It has everything; everything is in its place; and everything is trustworthy. There are preachers who turn first to Arnold when they want an exposition of a text. The volume for 1915 is published (Revell; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Revell have now become the publishers of Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman's *Present-Day Evangelism* (2s. 6d. net), which was issued in 1903. Dr. Chapman is better known in this country now than he was eleven years ago, and he is specially identified with the subject of this volume, which contains the principles on which he has conducted his successful missions.

Dr. James M. Gray, Minister of the Reformed Episcopal Church, and Dean of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, has written many books, all in the severest odour of theological conservatism. His latest book is a popular exposition of the first twelve chapters of Genesis, 'showing the bearing of Primeval History on Present and Coming Events.' The title is *Great Epochs of Sacred History and the Shadows they Cast* (Revell; 1s. 6d. net).

Our Redemption: Its Need, Method and Result, is the title of a volume of theological discourses by the Rev. Frederick A. Noble, D.D., LL.D. (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). The volume originally appeared in 1897, and has for some time been out of print. It is now reissued unaltered. The author of these sermons is far above the usual evangelistic preacher in understanding of the principles of interpretation and in ability to use the English language.

A Help to the Study of the Holy Spirit was written by the Rev. William Edward Biederwolf

and published in 1903. In 1904 it was transferred to another publisher, and passed through two editions. The fourth edition has been issued by still another publishing house, that of Messrs. Revell (2s. 6d. net). This edition has been revised and enlarged. The book does not break new ground in this most difficult subject, but it gathers together the Scripture evidence and from that evidence draws natural and on the whole reliable conclusions.

An attempt is being made by Mr. Edward Leigh Pell to make the Bible interesting to children by retelling in simple language the stories it contains. He has published *The Story of Jesus for Little People* (Revell; 1s. net); and he has had the courage to make Joseph himself tell *The Story of Joseph*, and David *The Story of David* (1s. net each). But far more successful and altogether more acceptable is the volume of Bible stories entitled *Tell me a True Story* which has been written by Mary Stewart (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

If you want to succeed choose well your—grandmother. A grandmother well chosen and worthy was Mrs. Hannah Whitall Smith. She took the office seriously. She prepared for it. She worked out its principles and then she applied them unswervingly. What are the principles of the good grandmother? First, she must love her grandchildren. Second, she must devote herself to her grandchildren. Third, she must see that her grandchildren have plenty of fun. Fourth, she must make sure that they are healthy. Fifth, she must train them to be good. These are the principles. If they seem obvious, let it be understood that it was in the application of them that this grandmother was great. In training her grandchildren to be good, for example, she first set before them what goodness is. Goodness is considerateness. Then she taught them to be good by never failing to commend them. Yet as you read her biography as a grandmother, written by one of her grandchildren, Ray Strachey, you conclude that the secret of her success was due to her application of the third principle; she took care always that her grandchildren had plenty of fun. Death came near one day: 'Daughter,' she said—this was to the mother of the grandchildren—'Daughter, if I die, remember I've put the children's fireworks on that top shelf.'

The title of the book is *A Quaker Grandmother* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

A quite elementary but also quite accurate study of the title 'Son of Man' is to be found in a small book with the name of *The Son of Man* (Scott; 2s. net) which has been written by the Rev. R. O. Shone, B.D. It is not a theological dissertation on the title; it is a volume of sermons, each sermon of which touches some aspect of the title, or of Him who bore it—His Ministry, His Authority, His Sufferings, His Triumph, His Glory, His Personality.

Every apologist must know his antagonist and must stick to him. The Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A., thinks it possible that there are 'sceptics of high culture' in the world, but he has nothing to do with them in the book of Apologetics which he has published under the title of *Common Objections to Christianity* (Scott; 5s. net). The sceptics of high culture may be occupied with such matters as the authority of the Bible or the divinity of Christ, but the sceptic of the public parks is troubled about none of these things. The public park orator and his great audience are interested in fundamental problems. Before the divinity of Christ arises, the problem has to be dealt with at some length as to whether there is any divinity at all in the universe. Similarly, before the problem is raised as to whether, and, if so, how far, God revealed Himself to the various writers of the Bible, the much more rudimentary question has to be answered as to why we should believe that God Himself exists. The ordinary sceptic has not got beyond atheism and materialism. And it is for the ordinary and half-educated sceptic that Mr. Drawbridge writes.

He writes well. His experience is ample, and he has educated himself for this work. He has prepared himself to answer the questions of the public park crowd and he has stood day after day answering them, sometimes, he says, for five hours at a stretch. He gives us much to think about. For the questions are here as fully and fairly as the answers. If only we could *prevent* our young men from becoming sceptics. This book should greatly help the preacher and the teacher to that end.

The General Secretary of the Student Christian Movement (93 Chancery Lane, London) has pub-

lished three pamphlets which must not be left lying beneath the load of larger books this month. One is *The Cultivation of the Inner Life*, by the Rev. Philip Loyd, Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon College (3d. net); one is *Christ the Teacher*, by W. M. Sedgwick of Somerville College, Oxford (6d. net); and one is *My Brother the Tramp*, by Mary Higgs (8d. net).

The little volume of *Bible Readings for Class and Home*, by the Rev. R. C. Joynt, M.A., has reached a second edition (Thynne; 1s. net).

A Solution of the Chief Difficulties in Revelation xx.-xxii.

By the Rev. R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A., Canon of Westminster.

II.

We have now dealt with the chief difficulties in 20–22. There are, of course, many of a subordinate nature affecting the original order of the text in 22, but they are treated shortly in the introductions to the various sections of the rearranged translation that follows. Chapters 21–22 are to be read in the following order.

20^{1-3}. Vision of the chaining of Satan for 1000 years.

21^{9}–$22^{2.\ 14-15.\ 17}$. Vision of the New Jerusalem which comes down to be the abode of Christ and the glorified martyrs, and the centre of a new evangelization of the nations for 1000 years.

20^{4-6}. Vision of the glorified martyrs who reign with Christ for 1000 years.

20^{7-10}. Vision of the loosing of Satan, and the attack of Gog and Magog on the holy city: of the destruction of the latter, and the casting of Satan into the lake of fire.

20^{11-15}. Vision of the great white throne, of the vanishing of the former heaven and earth: of the judgment of the dead, and of the casting of death and Hades into the lake of fire.

21^{1-4c} 22^{3-5}. Vision of the new heaven and the new earth: of the New Jerusalem descending from God to the new earth, in which the saints are to reign for ever.

21^{5c-8}.[1] Admonition of Christ conveyed through the Seer to his contemporaries.

$22^{6-7.\ 16.\ 13.\ 12}$. Declaration of Christ as to the truth of the words of the Seer.

[1] $21^{4d.\ 5ab}$ are probably later additions.

$22^{8-10.\ 18a.\ 20}$. John's personal attestation of the truth of the words of the prophecy of this book.[2]

Rearranged Translation.

(20^{1-3}. Satan chained for 1000 years, and the nations set free from his deceivings.)

1. And I saw an angel coming down from heaven,
Having the key of the abyss
And a great chain in his hand.

2. And he laid hold on the dragon, the old Serpent,
Which is the Devil and Satan,
And bound him for a thousand years:

3. And he cast him into the abyss,
And shut and sealed it over him,
That he should no more deceive the nations,
Till the thousand years should be fulfilled.

After this he must be loosed for a little time.

(21^{9}–$22^{2.\ 14-15.\ 17}$. Vision of the New Jerusalem, which descends from heaven and settles on the ruined site of the earthly Jerusalem. This heavenly city is at once the seat of the Messianic Kingdom, the abode of the glorified martyrs, and the centre of the evangelizing agencies of the surviving nations on the earth, during the millennial period. Though it is not stated, we must conclude that alike the glorified martyrs and the New Jerusalem

[2] $22^{11.\ 18b.\ 19}$ are most probably later additions.

are withdrawn from the earth before the final judgment.

The tree of life ($22^{2.14}$) appears to be for the new converts (22^{2}; cf. $14^{6.}$ $15^{3.4}$). Since the martyrs were already clothed with their heavenly bodies and were not subject to the second death. They had already eaten of it in the Paradise of God (2^{7}).

As one of the seven angels of the bowls showed Rome—the capital of the kingdom of the Antichrist—to the Seer (17^{1}), so he now shows him the heavenly Jerusalem.)

21^{9}. And there came one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls, who were laden with the seven last plagues; and he spake with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee
10. the bride, the wife of the Lamb. And he carried me away in the Spirit to a mountain great and high, and shewed me the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven
11. from God, having the glory of God: her light was like unto a stone most precious, as it
12. were a jasper stone, clear as crystal: having a wall great and high; having twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels; and names written thereon, which are the names of the
13. twelve tribes of the children of Israel: on the east were three gates; and on the north three gates; and on the south three gates;
14. and on the west three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of
15. the Lamb. And he that spake with me had for a measure a golden reed to measure the city, and the gates thereof, and the wall
16. thereof. And the city lieth foursquare, and the length thereof is as great as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs: the length and the breadth and the height thereof are equal.
17. And he measured the wall thereof, a hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of an angel.
18. And the building of the wall thereof was jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto
19. pure glass. The foundations of the wall of the city were adorned with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third,
20. chalcedony; the fourth, emerald; the fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolite; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, topaz; the tenth, chrysoprase; the eleventh, jacinth; the twelfth, amethyst.

21^{21}. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls:
Each one of the gates was of one pearl,
And the street of the city was pure gold, transparent as glass.

22. And I saw no temple therein;
For the Lord God Almighty is the temple thereof,
And the Lamb [is the tabernacle thereof[1]].

23. And the city hath no need of the sun nor yet of the moon to shine upon it;
For the glory of the Lord did lighten it,
And the lamp thereof is the Lamb.

24. And the nations shall walk by the light thereof,
And the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it,
25. And the gates thereof shall not be shut day *or night*.[2]

26. And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it,
27. And there shall not enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination or a lie:
But only they which are written in the book of life of the Lamb.

22^{1}. And he showed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal,
2. Proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb, in the midst of the street thereof.
And on this side of the river and on that was the tree[3] of life,

[1] A possible restoration; the original is lost. The English versions conceal this loss by transposing the words 'And the Lamb' into the preceding sentence.

[2] The text reads 'for there shall be no night there'—a corruption due in part to 22^{5}. As in Is 60^{11} the text clearly ran as I have emended: 'Thy gates . . . shall not be shut day or night.' The alternations of day and night still prevail on the earth. It is otherwise in 22^{5} where the New Jerusalem has come down from God to the new and glorified earth. Besides, the parallelism is against it.

[3] The term is used generically. The text implies that there are two rows of trees, one on either side of the river.

Bearing twelve manner of fruits,
Yielding its fruit every month:
And the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

22[14]. Blessed are they that wash their robes,
That they may have the right to come to the tree of life,
And may enter in by the gates into the city.

15. Without are the dogs, and the sorcerers,
And the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters,
And every one that loveth and maketh a lie.

17. And the Spirit and the bride[1] say, Come:
And let him that heareth say, Come:
And let him that is athirst come:
Whosoever willeth let him take of the water of life freely.

(20[4-6]. Vision of the glorified martyrs who reign with Christ for 1000 years.)

20[4]. And I saw [thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and][2] the souls of them that had been beheaded for the witness of Christ
And for the word of God,
And which had not worshipped the beast,
Nor yet his image,
And had not received the mark upon their forehead
And upon their hand.
And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years,

5. But the rest of the dead lived not till the thousand years were fulfilled.

6. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection:
Over these the second death hath no power:
But they shall be priests of God and of Christ,
And shall reign with him a thousand years.

(20[7-10]. Close of the Millennial Kingdom and of its evangelizing activities. Thereupon follows the loosing of Satan, the march of Gog and Magog against the beloved city, their destruction by supernatural means, and the casting of Satan into the lake of fire. The Seer does not say what became of the New Jerusalem, but its withdrawal from the earth before the final judgment is presupposed. Since 'the beloved city' in 20[9] is the New Jerusalem, the saints referred to in the same verse must include the risen martyrs.)

20[7]. And when the thousand years are finished,
8. Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall come forth to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to the war: the number of whom is as the sand of the
9. sea. And they went up over the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down out of heaven, and devoured
10. them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where are also the beast and the false prophet; and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.

(20[11-15]. Vision of the great white throne and of Him that sat thereon. Disappearance of the former heaven and the former earth. Judgment of the dead. Death and hell cast into the lake of fire.)

20[11]. And I saw a great white throne and him that sat thereon,
And from his face the earth and the heaven fled away,
And no place was found for them.

12. And I saw the dead [the great and the small] standing before the throne,
And the books were opened, and another book was opened [which is the book of life],
And the dead were judged out of the things written in the books [according to their works].

[1] Since the term 'bride' designates the New Jerusalem in our author (cf. 21[2. 9]) it has no doubt the same meaning here.

[2] These clauses may have come from the hand of our author, but their meaning is obscure here: also the parallelism is against them, and the syntax. By their removal the verb 'saw' and its accusative 'souls' are brought together, whereas in the text as it stands they are separated by two independent clauses.

20^{13}. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it;
And death and Hades gave up the dead which were in them:
And they were judged every man according to his works.

14. And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire,
[This is the second death, the lake of fire[1]]
15. And all that were not found written in the book of life
Were cast into the lake of fire.

(21^{1-4} 22^{3-5}. The creation of the new heaven and the new earth. Descent of the New Jerusalem adorned as a bride for her husband. God tabernacles with men. No more grief or pain or tears or death. All the faithful are to reign with Christ for ever and ever (22^{5}), whereas in the Millennial Kingdom only the risen martyrs were to reign for 1000 years.)

21^{1}. And I saw a new heaven and a new earth,
For the first heaven and the first earth had passed away,
Nor was there any more sea.

2. And the holy city, New Jerusalem, I saw,
Coming down out of heaven from God,
Made ready as a bride adorned for her husband.

3. And I heard a great voice from the throne saying:

Behold the tabernacle of God is with men,
And he shall dwell with them,
And they shall be his peoples,
And God himself shall be with them.

4. And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes,
And death shall be no more:
Neither shall there be crying nor mourning nor pain,
22^{3}. Neither shall be any more curse.

[1] A marginal gloss repeated from $21^{8f.}$, where the clause is full of meaning, but it is wholly out of place here with regard to death and Hades.

And the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it,
And his servants shall serve him,
22^{4}. And they shall see his face,
And his name shall be on their foreheads.

5. And there shall be no more night;
And they have no need of light of lamp or light of sun,
For the Lord God shall give them light,
And they shall reign for ever and ever.

(21^{4d-8}. Admonition conveyed through the Seer to his contemporaries. These verses contain many clauses that are repeated subsequently: cf. $22^{13ac.\ 15.\ 17}$.)

$21^{4d.\ 5}$. [The first things are passed away. And He that sitteth on the throne said, Behold I make all things new.][1] And he saith, Write: for all these things are faithful and
6. true. And he said unto me, [They are come to pass][2]

I am the Alpha and the Omega,
The beginning and the end.
I will give to him that thirsteth of the fountain of the water of life freely:
7. He that overcometh shall inherit these things,
And I will be his God,
And he shall be my son.

8. But for the fearful and unbelieving,
And abominable and murderers,
And fornicators and sorcerers,
And idolaters and all liars—
Their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone:
Which is the second death.

(22^{6-21}. Here more than anywhere else in chapters 20–22 have we the *disjecta membra* of the Poet Seer. We have already assigned $22^{14-15.\ 17}$ to the section dealing with the New Jerusalem which comes down from heaven during the Millennial Kingdom.

[1] Two of these clauses may be original, but, if so, I cannot discover their original context. The Greek of the phrase 'He that sitteth on the throne' is against our author's style. He would have written ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον.

[2] Probably an interpolation.

We have now to arrange, if possible, the rest of this section in the order intended by the Seer. It is, however, fragmentary. With a view to its arrangement, we observe first of all that Jesus is the speaker in $^{12\text{-}13.\ 16}$ and likewise in $^{6\text{-}7}$; for in these last two verses the speaker is distinguished from the angel who showed the Seer the things that must shortly come to pass, and the words 'and behold I come quickly' in ^{7} are most naturally spoken by Christ. Moreover, as Moffatt has recognized, $^{12\text{-}13.\ 16}$ can be restored into their original order by reading them as follows: $^{16.\ 13.\ 12}$. Thus this section is to be read as follows: $^{6\text{-}7.\ 16.\ 13.\ 12}$. After these naturally follows $^{8\text{-}11}$, beginning with the words, 'And I John am he that heard and saw these things.' I have bracketed ^{11} as conflicting with $21^{6\text{-}8}$, which apparently refer to evangelistic appeals during the Seer's lifetime. 22^{18} appears to be a fresh utterance of Christ as giving His imprimatur to the book. $22^{18b\text{-}19}$ are against the style and matter of the book.)

22^{6}. And he said unto me, These words are faithful and true: and the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets, sent his angel to shew unto his servants the things which
7. must shortly come to pass. And behold, I come quickly. Blessed is he that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book.

16. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify these things for the Churches:
I am the root and the offspring of David,
The bright, the morning star.

13. I am the Alpha and the Omega,
The first and the last,
The beginning and the end.

12. Behold I come quickly;
And my reward is with me,
To render to each man according as his work is.

22^{8}. And I John am he that heard and saw these things. And when I heard and saw, I fell down before the feet of the angel
9. which shewed me these things. And he saith unto me, See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them which keep the words of this book: worship God.
10. And he saith unto me, Seal not up the words of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand.
11. [He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still:
And he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still:
And he that is righteous, let him do righteousness still:
And he that is holy, let him be made holy still.[1]]
18. I testify to every one that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. [If any man shall add unto them God shall add unto him the plagues which are written
19. in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city,
20. which are written in this book.][2] He which testifieth these things saith, Yea: I come
21. quickly. Amen: come, Lord Jesus. The grace of the Lord Jesus be with the saints.

[1] I have with some hesitation bracketed this verse as a gloss. They refer to the Seer's contemporaries. But if $21^{6\text{-}8}$ refer also to his contemporaries, then there is still hope for them, if they repent.

[2] These clauses appear to be interpolated; for they misunderstand the purpose of the tree of life, which was to sustain the blessed that were converted from amongst the nations during the Millennial Kingdom ($22^{2.\ 14}$) and not in the heavenly Jerusalem which came down on the new earth, where no such sustenance was needed. Besides, the phrase 'words of the book of this prophecy' is against our author's usage elsewhere: cf. $22^{7.\ 10.\ 18}$ (1^{3}).

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF PSALMS.

Psalm li. 4.

Against thee, thee only, have I sinned,
And done that which is evil in thy sight:
That thou mayest be justified when thou speakest,
And be clear when thou judgest.

1. According to the very old tradition preserved in the headings of the Psalms, these words are part of a song of heart-stricken penitence, drawn from David's soul when 'Nathan the prophet came unto him' (2 S 12[1]), and said unto him, 'Thou art the man.' When the awful conviction once made its way into his inner being, it would thus appear that its prompt result was a cry of woe, shame, and repentance, addressed direct to God. It was borne in upon him with an ineffable consciousness that, while he had sinned, and sinned tremendously, against Bathsheba and against Uriah, and also against every soul that could ever be stumbled by that great crime wrought by God's servant, he had first and in the deepest respect sinned against God. So deeply, so supremely, had he aggrieved Him, that the other aspects of the offence were swallowed up, in a sense, in this: 'Against thee, thee only.'

2. Never, perhaps, were words uttered which expressed more simply, yet at the same time more fully, the entire substance of genuine contrition. Accordingly this Fifty-first Psalm has been adopted by the Christian Church as the most adequate exponent of her religious feeling in penitential seasons. And yet it is no mere liturgy for days of humiliation, not a mere penitential psalm designed to guide the devotions of sorrow-stricken sinners to the end of time, not simply a Miserere, as we call it in our technical way of speaking; certainly it is all this, but it is much more, even the real utterance, the genuine outpouring, of a broken and contrite heart. It is this that gives the Psalm its special value as an expression of penitential feeling. One feels assured that its author is thoroughly in earnest; that he is not describing the mental condition of an imaginary penitent; that he has not, so to speak, thrown himself into an attitude, for the sake of producing a hymn for the use of repentant sinners. Surely these touching words are the outgrowth of true and bitter experience. The Psalmist describes that which he has himself felt, and that which he felt was the natural fruit of that which he had himself done.

The text falls easily into two divisions, and we shall deal with it under these headings—

I. The Sinner's Conviction of Sin.

II. God's Justification in the Punishment of Sinners.

I.

The Sinner's Conviction of Sin.

Men may be roughly classified into three groups: those who have little sense of sin, those who think of it chiefly as an inconvenience caused to their friends and neighbours, and those who have been compelled to recognize that it is a paramount offence against God. It is not easy to say whether the first or the second class is the more numerous, for the frontier between them wavers. Those who belong to the third class often find themselves in a minority, but they, at least, stand upon the threshold of a new life. The writer of the Psalm before us is their type and spokesman.

1. In considering this text, the most salient point, among many which strike one, is that the speaker has a deep and practical sense of the reality of sin. Let us for a moment contrast the attitude of the Psalmist with that which too many of us are at times disposed to assume. See how he tears away the veil, and lays bare the truth to the eye of God and man. See, on the other hand, how easy men find it to slide into the comfortable assurance that their own case is not so bad after all, that it admits of palliation, that they are no worse than their neighbours, no worse than other men of their own age, position, or calling, or that an equitable judgment must be pronounced over them, which shall take account of their whole lives, balancing the fancied good against the real evil. Now, one of the most fertile sources of this terrible hallucination is the want of a real, true sense of the reality of sin, and the want of a clear perception of the reality of moral evil, of demerit, and of wrong-doing.

This want of a clear perception of moral evil may take various shapes and spring from various causes. For example, we sometimes encounter philosophical speculations which go to the practical denial of all moral evil. It is

argued that man is a complicated piece of mechanism, an automaton, so to speak, which, placed in given circumstances, will inevitably produce ascertained results; or again, that what we call moral evil is incidental to an imperfect creature gradually struggling onwards and upwards to perfection, the growing pains, in fact, which belong to moral progress. I will not stop to consider such theories now: it is enough to say that they are not only inconsistent with the very foundations of Christianity, but utterly subversive of common morality.[1]

2. The peculiar accent put upon sin by this inspired penitent denotes a man who had hitherto possessed a keen, lifelong sense of God. If we are repelled by what we may choose to call a tone of exaggeration in this self-abasing phraseology, it is obvious that we are dominated by the apathy of an ignorant, primitive heathenism, possibly even by a temper of rank atheism. The foul, insidious leaven of an old-world superstition often secretes itself within our hearts, when the rude obsolete images of our forefathers have gone into museums. The tendency to shift the centres of obligation from the heavenly into the earthly spheres, to hustle the Divine throne into a land of oblivion, and put the expediencies of modern high life upon the horizon, is a note of that unspiritual temper with which the grosser Gentile idolatries took their rise. There can be no surer mark of this bias than to say the wrong of sin begins and ends with the person against whom it is committed. Man's rights are of transcendent importance, but for the obvious reason that God is above, around, and within man; and if you eliminate God, you take all life and strength out of obligation, and make it powerless to bind.

The bill of sin has not wholly been paid when reparation has been made to our injured brethren, there is still God to reckon with. Suppose as a parent you heard of some wrong to your son, and when you spoke to the one who inflicted the wrong he should retort: 'What has it to do with you, the dispute is between your son and myself, not with you?' I fancy you would reply with indignation, even if your son was partly to blame, 'He who hurts my son, hurts me.' Nay, some would more strongly affirm, 'You have struck my son—no, not my son, but me.' God is our Great Father, and every wrong against man is also a wrong inflicted upon Him. This can also be applied to national and social evils. Wrong to the weaker sections of humanity is a wrong permitted or committed against God. James Russell Lowell states it succinctly in those well-known lines:

> He's true to God who's true to man;
> Wherever wrong is done,
> To the humblest and the weakest,
> 'Neath the all-beholding sun.[2]

[1] W. B. Jones, *The Peace of God*, 34.
[2] Ernest F. Drew.

3. The evil of sin consists chiefly in its being committed against God. This fact is brought home to our hearts if we consider the following points.

(1) *God is our Maker.*—Here is the highest obligation of which we can form a conception. 'Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?' With equal absurdity would he say to his Creator, 'Why dost Thou command me thus?' We who are parents claim the right to command our children; and when they disobey, we place the main point of their offending in simple disobedience. We lay our prohibitions upon them in things which they already know to be wrong; and when they transgress, the burden of our indignation rests on their disregard of our mandate. But what is our boasted right to command them, compared with God's right to command us? And what is the aggravation of violating a parent's authority, compared with that of rebellion against the Eternal Father of our spirits?

(2) *God sustains us.*—In His hand our breath is, and His are all our ways. From the dawn of our existence to this hour, He has been mindful of us, with more than a parent's tender care. Amid countless dangers, He has cast His shield about us. When one has fallen on our right hand and another on our left, He has said unto us, Live. Each breath we draw thus increases our obligation to obey Him. To break His commands to-day is a greater sin than it was yesterday. To break them to-morrow will be a still deeper crime.

(3) *He has compassed us with countless blessings.*—The earth itself is made for man. For us, it is beautiful with flowers and verdure. For us, it yields its increase. To us are given the beasts of the field, the fowls of heaven, and the fish of the sea. For us, the rivers flow, the oceans roll, the clouds distil, and the seasons keep their appointed times. His sun is made to light us by day, His moon and stars by night. To shield us from cold, He has provided raiment—from heat, a shade—from storms, a shelter. He has constituted us social beings—with tongues that can speak—with ears that can discriminate—with hearts that can sympathize. Verily He hath done all things well for us. And shall we deny our obligations to keep His commandments?

(4) *He has prepared a heaven for our eternal home.*—His purposes for men's good are great and

glorious, like His own infinite goodness. He who is the angels' Lord and our Brother, hath said, 'In my Father's house are many mansions'; and He invites us to a residence where are joys which 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.' It is the abode of His own infinite blessedness—the palace of His glory—the home of holy angels.

II.

God's Justification in the Punishment of Sinners.

If the Psalmist had wherewithal to accuse himself, and to excuse God, we have more. He sinned before the will of God was fully revealed, before the gospel was published, before the Holy Ghost was given, before God's terrible wrath at sin was thoroughly made known by the spectacle of His only Son dying upon the Cross to put it away, thus proving how hateful it was in His sight, before the Saviour had risen again to set the seal to the faith of His followers, before His ascension to His Father's right hand in triumph, before prophecies had been fulfilled, before the universal spread of the gospel, in spite of all opposition and every obstacle, had carried conviction to the minds of men that it was of God, before the holy influence it was found to have upon the nations who received it gave token of the holy source from which it was derived. Before all these events had come to pass it was that David sinned; in comparative darkness, therefore, in comparative weakness and frailty, in comparative lack of God's helping hand to keep him up. Yet even he felt that he could set up no sufficient defence of himself; he could not but feel that he had light enough to have lived far otherwise than he had done; and he acknowledged therefore that God would be justified in visiting him with His wrath and His vengeance, and would be clear of all blame in so doing were He to be judged. But if it were so with the Psalmist, how will it be with us, on whom the ends of the world are come, and from whom dimness hath been all removed?

1. In the first place, here we are alive this day, after having offered God provocations to cut us down many a time, for many a year. Surely if God had smitten us down long ago, none amongst us could have said He was hasty, none amongst us could have accused Him of a want of forbearance in so dealing with us. Ask your consciences to bear witness against you for the wilful ways in which you had set God's wrath at nought, in divers manners, in times past, and see whether you have not reason to wonder that you are alive to call those sins to remembrance to-day. We are living under the government of the same God whose heavy wrath fell upon the sinners in the wilderness, and slew them whilst the meat was *yet in their mouth*—that is, not tarrying at all. And yet, here we are, after having tempted God to strike over and over again, here we are alive and well this day, spared after all. No man amongst us, therefore, can pretend to set up this defence for himself at the judgment of God, if God should one of these days *suddenly* call him to it, that he had not time given him. God had given him time, till He was tired of giving him more, when He saw it wasted and abused. And as he would not redeem *time*, He would make him rue the *eternity*; and in this, surely, is God justified, and clear when He is judged.

> We have known Him under sublime epithets, but they have not moved us. Everlasting, infinite, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent—all these great words have been applied to God, but they do not move us. They touch our admiration; sometimes they kindle our fancy, and send us poetizing and speculating without profit. But when we come to forbearance—power to strike, yet unwillingness to do so; when we come to questions that are full of agony; when we see God disappointed, grieved with us, and yet withholding judgment—we cannot but feel that the book which reveals such a God is a good book.[1]

2. In the next place, we dwell in a land where a great light shines. No man whose birthplace is England can plead against God that He is exacting of him a Christian course without giving him opportunities of Christian knowledge—that He is demanding bricks without giving straw. God has provided the people with churches to go to, and promised His special blessing on the two or three that shall be gathered together in them. God has provided ministers to preach the Word and to lead the prayers of the people in those churches. God has provided Bibles in abundance, printed in our mother tongue. God has provided Sacraments—the one the covenanted mode of the spiritual birth, the other the covenanted mode of spiritual food and sustenance after that birth. Opportunities of receiving knowledge and grace, and growing in knowledge and grace, God has afforded to all

[1] Joseph Parker, *Studies in Texts*, 95.

whose lot it is to be born in this land; and if any at doom's-day perish by reason of their lack of knowledge, it is not God that is to blame but themselves. He will still be justified in His saying, and clear when He is judged.

Sin is contradiction, not misinformation. Not merely lack of knowledge, but, as we see every day, it is committed in defiance of knowledge, the act of sheer wilfulness. It is a deliberate assertion of ourselves as against the supreme law which we perfectly understand.[1]

There is a great truth underlying that Persian allegory which tells of two youths who at death found themselves in the eternal world. One of them was met by a fearsome hag from whom he recoiled with horror, the other by a beautiful maiden who led him through the gates of paradise to the fairest scenes and sweetest enjoyment. Who were these? each youth asked, and to each the answer came: 'I am your *self* as you have formed it and sent it on before you.' The 'true thing' which we need most of all to 'think on' in this relation is that we are each one forming ourselves as we shall find ourselves in the hereafter, and as we shall be able to act in the life thereof. The 'true hereafter' is that which we make for ourselves.

Sculptors of life we are as we stand
With our souls uncarved before us,
Waiting the hour when at God's command
Our life-dream passes o'er us.

If we carve it then on the yielding stone,
With many a sharp incision,
Its heavenly beauties shall be our own,
Our lives that angel-vision.[2]

3. In the third place, we have not only time given us to turn to God *in*, and opportunities of knowledge given us to turn to God *by*, but, as if God would not be hindered in serving and saving us if it were possible, He has put a *conscience* in every one of us—a conscience which must make itself felt sometimes, even by the man who thinks least about the value of his time and neglects every opportunity of knowledge. No one who has a conscience can justly say God has abandoned him and left him to himself, and that his ruin (if ruined he is) is not of his own seeking. His conscience is, in fact, God within him, telling him what to do and what to forbear doing. It is true a man may persevere in resisting the warnings of conscience from within till its voice will be lifted up no more, conscience being dead; but it must be a long and desperate course of sin that will effect this. And still, in such a case, it is not God that must be blamed for such a man's hardness of heart and deadness to all spiritual concerns and consequent everlasting perdition, but a man's self. God will be justified in His saying, and clear when He is judged.

The greatest treasure a man can have is a good conscience. Whether our lives be crowned with material success does not depend upon our souls, and is beyond our foreseeing; but the crown of life, which is the crown of righteousness, is within every man's winning. It may go with riches or it may not, it may go with pain or it may not, it may go with power or it may not; but it is more precious than all those together, and will last when they have all faded away. No man need fear to look his fellows in the face, no man need shrink from the hardest duty, if he has so lived as to possess a good conscience. No man need be afraid of persecution or desertion at the hands of his fellows, nor need he quail for sorrow and affliction, if conscience be on his side. He need not fear to die, or to stand at God's Judgment Bar with this fast and weighty ally. Happy is the man who, like Bunyan's Pilgrim, has made a tryst with conscience to meet him at the river and to accompany him across, for, when in this life, or in that which is to come, a good conscience says, 'Well done,' it is the voice of the Judge Himself.[3]

4. In the last place, we have all had *warnings* enough in the circumstances about us and the events of our lives, which preach to us in a manner that must make a deaf man hear—warnings enough to acquit God of taking us by surprise if He should cast us off. Our friends have died, we ourselves have been sick, and our fortunes have been shaken, our hopes have been frustrated, our views blasted, our dependence upon man, whose breath is in his nostrils, has been found a vain thing; God has tried in every way to weaken our confidence in earth and all that belongs to it, and to convince us that the fashion thereof passeth away, and to lead us by the hand to other and higher hopes—to mansions not made with hands, to the Kingdom that Christ hath purchased for us by His blood, which endureth throughout all ages. And if these warnings are still of no avail, and we regard them without laying them to heart, still the fault is our own, not God's: He is justified in His saying by providing such warnings, and clear when He is judged.

In all human judgments there are things we can dispute, elements of misconception on which we can fasten for our relief, a lack of fine equitable balance which becomes the raw material of our makeshift consolations. But in the judgment of Divine love there is nothing to be challenged, not the least oversight on which a man can fasten and think himself something midway between a martyr and a male-

[1] W. L. Watkinson, *The Ashes of Roses*, 10.
[2] W. L. Walker, *The True Christ*, 221.
[3] John Watson, *Respectable Sins*, 183.

factor. The verdict upon which it rests is inevitable, and the sentence which follows is stamped with hopeless, indisputable finality.[1]

LITERATURE.

Blunt (J. J.), *Plain Sermons*, i. 72.
Bradby (E. H.), *Sermons Preached at Haileybury*, 201.
Chafer (L. S.), *True Evangelism*, 154.
Cheyne (T. K.), *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism*, 183.
Gregory (J. R.), *Scripture Truths*, 135.
Jones (W. B.), *The Peace of God*, 29.
Magee (W. C.), *The Octagon Chapel*, 33.
,, ,, *Christ the Light of All Scripture*, 81.
Moule (H. C. G.), *From Sunday to Sunday*, 41.
Selby (T. G.), *The Alienated Crown*, 156.
Watkinson (W. L.), *The Ashes of Roses*, 8.
Churchman's Pulpit: Ash Wednesday, v. 261 (E. B. Pusey).
Church Pulpit Year Book, 1912, p. 44.
National Preacher, iii. 57 (R. Emerson).

[1] T. G. Selby, *The Alienated Crown*, 174.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford.

Dr. Langdon is indefatigable. We have hardly finished digesting his book on *Tammuz and Istar* when a new and elaborate work of his on the early Sumerian texts of Babylonia makes its appearance. This forms the thirty-first volume of the records of the 'Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania,' and contains some interesting and important historical and religious texts from the library of Nippur, which was destroyed in the Abrahamic age (*Historical and Religious Texts from the Temple Library of Nippur*, Munich, 1914). They have been copied by Dr. Langdon partly in America and partly in Constantinople.

The place of honour is naturally given to a Sumerian poem from which we learn that the reign of the famous Naram-Sin lasted only seven years, and that it ended in misfortune, perhaps at the hands of a usurper. As two reigns at least intervened between those of Sargon (3800 B.C.) and of Naram-Sin the statement of Nabonidos that he was the 'son' of Sargon must be understood in the sense of 'descendant.' It would seem that he was the last of Sargon's race. The poem is followed by two 'Lamentations'—the prototype of the Lamentations of Jeremiah—over the destruction of the cities of Kesh and Nippur at the hands of the Kurdish tribes, and at a much later day of Ur by the Elamites. Dr. Langdon is doubtless right in concluding that the first event ushered in the rule of the dynasty of Gutium or Kurdistan, though in giving a list of the kings of the dynasty he has included a prince who lived about a century before its commencement. The Lamentation over the fall of Ur alludes to the capture by the Elamites of the last king of the dynasty of Ur.

Among the other texts edited and translated by Dr. Langdon is an interesting ode on the coronation of King Dungi of Ur (about 2500 B.C.), an early model of what such effusions ought to be. Another interesting text, which is unfortunately only a mere fragment, is the 'Lament of a Sumerian Job,' of which the burden is that 'a man of desolation am I.' It is the earliest prototype of the Biblical book of Job yet discovered, and exemplifies once more how dependent Semitic literature was upon the older culture of Sumer. The Assyriologist may be pardoned if at times he wonders whether there was anything really original in it.

Dr. Langdon concludes his work with translations of some Semitic texts. One of these is a tablet containing part of the Code of Khammurabi specially made for the law-courts of Nippur, and possibly anterior to the standard edition of the Code. Two others are medical texts which, as might be expected, contain more magic than medicine. They are full of curious terms and names of plants and stones which Dr. Langdon has made valorous efforts to identity. The signification of the plant-names, however, must be settled rather by botany than by philology. Personally I am very sceptical as to the success of the attempts made by German scholars in this direction.

Dr. Langdon is one of the best living Sumerian scholars, and his translations of these difficult texts represent the high-water mark of what can be done

with them to-day. In many details the translations will doubtless be corrected and improved by future research, and the obscurities and literary *bêtises* which they seem to exhibit will be cleared away, as has been the case with the Semitic texts of Babylonia. When we remember that even the Semitic scribes of later Babylonia were not always sure about the signification of a Sumerian phrase, the difficulties which beset the best-equipped modern translator can be easily understood.

In the Study.

Fresh Literature for the Pulpit.

WHATEVER other gifts are possessed by the Rev. Archibald Alexander, B.D., he has the gift of effective public speech. His new book *The Glory in the Grey* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.) contains, he says, forty-two *talks* on everyday life and religion. 'Talks' is the right word. It used to be addresses. But the address was never so compact of familiarity and reverence. And, above all, the addresses were never so deftly shot through with illustration. Every talk is lit up with appropriate anecdote or analogy. But we shall choose one that has less illustration than usual, to show what the talk can be as a sketch of character.

Toward.

In the life of Daniel and in that of Lot there is a 'note of direction' which is very significant. Daniel opened his windows *toward* Jerusalem, and Lot pitched his tent *toward* Sodom. In these contrasted directions, the life-stories of the two men are told in brief.

Every character has one supreme direction. There is no gainsaying that, I imagine. We have all many interests in life. There are many directions in which we develop our original holding. We are keen on this, that, or the other thing. But on analysis it must be found that one of these is supreme. When there is a conflict of interests, there are some that we allow to go to the wall.

It was as much Daniel's wish as it would have been yours or mine to keep out of the lions' den and to stand well with the king. But he saw clearly that to follow that direction would be for him to be false to his God. There, then, were two competing motives. He had to elect one to the supreme place. And he had done it when he opened his windows toward Jerusalem in the sight of the whole town.

Lot, likewise, knew what Sodom was. There was the talk of the countryside about Sodom's reputation, and there was a voice of God within his own heart. On the other hand were the man's keen commercial instincts and his love of money. He had to elect one of these directions to be the supreme one. And he had made his choice when he pitched his tent toward Sodom. There is a direction in life which a man makes supreme. It can be what he likes. It may be Daniel's, or Lot's, or countless others besides. But a chief and controlling direction every man must have, every man actually has. The question is—What is it? Toward what?

For it is direction that is the only true and just test of character. That there are other tests we all know, and many of us have winced under them. The matter-of-fact world has its tests for all religious profession. Of course, it is practical. 'Let us see what they do,' it says. And too often it has cause to point its finger in scorn at the doings which it can see. The critic, both without us and within us, asks for facts, and there they are, some of them shameful, dishonouring, damning facts! Now, I do not for one moment seek to underrate the value of that standard. But I want you to know that there is a fairer test than that, Heaven's test. The world asks, 'What does the man do?' But Heaven asks, 'What was he trying to do? What is the main set and purpose of his life?' By a blamable error in navigation the ship may run out of her course, or a tempest may drive her headlong before it. But the question at last comes to be—What port was the captain trying to reach?

It is the easiest thing in the world to pick faults in the life of the Christian man or woman. Peter once denied his Lord with curses. But is there no difference between his cowardice, sad and shameful as it was, and the cold, calculating spite of the Chief Priests who did Jesus to death? Peter's

denial was not a fair sample of his attitude toward the Master. We say of a river that it flows south, if that is its main direction, even though for a little it may bend some other way. Peter turned shamefully north in his course for a while, but the river of his love was, over all, southwards and Christ-wards for all that. And Christ knew it. He always knows it. Even from the legitimate discipline of conscience and the sneers of his friends, a man feels that there is an appeal to Christ Himself, who knows. We have wandered and turned aside, but Christ knows whether we love Him or not, whether we are really trying to follow Him or not.

You remember how Christian and his friend Pliable in the *Pilgrim's Progress* fell into the Slough of Despond together, and got plentifully bemired in consequence? Bunyan's whole passage is a masterpiece, but there is one touch in it that is unsurpassed. After describing how Pliable turns tail and leaves Christian, Bunyan goes on: 'Wherefore Christian was left to tumble in the Slough of Despond alone, but still he endeavoured to struggle to that side that was furthest from his own house and next to the wicket gate.' There you have the test of direction, met and passed! The side next the wicket gate! Ah, my brothers, there is no promise that we shall escape the pitfalls and the accidents even though we follow the light from Heaven, but if only we struggle toward the far side of the bog, if, miry as we are, we clamber forward to the side nearest to the gate of God, it surely will be well with us in the end. For it is not his falls that altogether determine whether a man be a true Christian pilgrim or not. It is the side he makes for out of the mire.

I have sometimes imagined to myself another ending to the Parable of the Prodigal Son. I have seemed to see the wanderer come limping and weary all those sorrowful miles back on the way home. But night fell as he was getting in among the old landmarks, and the cold chilled him, and his strength was nearly spent. Yet he struggled bravely on till he came to the road-end that turned up for home, but there he had to give in. There he fell down at last, and lay, face forward, with his arms outstretched, as if he would have gone farther if he could. There the hired servants found him in the morning, cold and stiff and dead. When they brought the old man out, do you think he turned away because the confession had not been spoken? Ah, no. He read in those outstretched arms what it was the wanderer had tried to say. And with tears in his eyes and a great gladness in his heart, he said, 'It is my son, come home.' It is with a judgment and a love like that we have to do. A love that looks more at what we aim at than at what we reach. A Master who generously counts for service what we should have liked to do. A Father who looks, not at the fall only, but at the road we were travelling on when we fell.

The Right Rev. Arthur Vincent Green, LL.D., Bishop of Ballarat, has published a volume of *Australian Sermons* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). Their first distinguishing feature is their unfailing contact with reality. The Bishop of Ballarat does not believe that the sermon is worth preaching which never descends from the clouds. The next feature of distinction is that the earth upon which they move is their hearers' own land. They are Australian Sermons. The illustrations also are Australian.

One of the sermons is on Prayer. Here is an illustration in it:

'You who are busy pratical-minded Australians will ask perhaps, But what after all is the good of prayer? Let me answer you from a familiar experience of all who visit or live in one of our larger towns. You enter an electric tram-car. Above you is the live wire, charged with power. But how is the power to be applied to the car? By the trolly-pole which connects the car below with the wire above. Now the car represents the human life, and the electric wire is the life of God and the trolly-pole is prayer. Let the pole run off the wire, and you can no longer illuminate your car, and presently it slows and stops. So, when there is no prayer there is no inward light in man nor power of moral and spiritual progress. The unnatural thing is not to pray. Naturally we belong to God. All that is best in us thrives only by sharing in His life. The brute cannot pray: the man can.'

The Rev. William Temple, M.A., formerly Headmaster of Repton, has published a selection from his sermons to the boys there. It is his second volume of School Sermons. But this time he has included two or three University Sermons. We like the School Sermons best. In them we see at once what the preacher wants us to believe and do; and it is always worth believing and doing.

The title of the volume is *Studies in the Spirit and Truth of Christianity* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net).

Portrait painting is always more attractive to the multitude than landscape painting; and *Portrait Preaching* is always more attractive than doctrinal or ethical preaching. So, under that title, Mr. H. Jeffs has issued a volume of addresses on the most notable persons in the Bible (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net), and the volume is sure to do well.

Mr. Jeffs does justice to Timothy. And he attributes much of Timothy's usefulness in life to his knowledge of the Bible. 'The Bible,' he says, 'needs to be slowly absorbed from childhood as the Bread of Life until it passes into the blood and bone of the Bible reader. It is such a Bible student, a Bible student because he loves the Bible, who in later years will make the ablest, the most interesting, and the most convincing expositor of the Bible; and the Bible expositor was never more called for than he is to-day.'

An exposition of the Fourth Gospel has been written by Professor W. W. Holdsworth, M.A., of Handsworth. It is not a word for word commentary, nor is it a paragraph by paragraph exposition. Professor Holdsworth believes that the Fourth Gospel (whoever wrote it—John the Apostle most probably) is a work of art with beginning, middle, and end. So expounded, every event and even every saying gains its place and purpose.

Professor Holdsworth takes the whole Gospel as genuine, including the narrative of the Raising of Lazarus. His defence of that miracle is a triumph of simplicity and persuasion. The book is called *The Life Indeed* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net).

It is impossible to give any idea of what Mr. Charles Edwards means by *Things to Grip* (Scott; 2s. net) except by sample. Here is one of the outline addresses in the book:

The Flags.

There are three Flags generally used on our railways to regulate the trains, and ensure safety—*Red*, *Green*, and *White*. *Red* for Danger, *Green* for Caution, and *White* to say all is right.

The Holy Spirit uses many Bible flags, but there are three special ones we may observe.

1. The Red Flag of Danger. *Beware.* 'Because there is wrath, beware lest he take thee away with his stroke; then a great ransom cannot deliver thee' (*Job* xxxvi. 18).

Yes, there is wrath, God's abiding displeasure against sin. That is awful.

Where is it? In Hell, and upon the conscience of every unsaved soul. The sense of it brings hell. There *is* wrath (*Job* xxxvi. 18), there is *abiding* wrath (*John* iii. 36), and there is *wrath to come* (*Matt.* iii. 7).

But it is very blessed to know 'God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ' (1 *Thess.* v. 9), and the believer can say, 'Even Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come' (1 *Thess.* i. 10).

2. The Green Flag of Caution. *Repent.* 'The Kingdom of God is at hand. Repent ye and believe the Gospel' (*Mark* i. 15). 'Repent ye and be converted' (*Acts* iii. 19). 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish' (*Luke* xiii. 3). 'But now commandeth all men everywhere to repent' (*Acts* xvii. 30).

What is Repentance? A new mind about God, Sin, Life, and Eternal things. It is the action of the soul by faith turning round to God. It is 'Godly sorrow' (2 *Cor.* vii. 10). 'Mourning for sin' (1 *Cor.* v. 2). 'Awaking out of sleep' (*Eph.* v. 14). 'Turning to God. Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ' (*Acts* xx. 21). These bring salvation. Repentance is the holy, divine caution of the soul. See that the plough of repentance goes deep enough to prepare the heart for pardon.

3. The White Flag of Peace and Safety. *Mercy.* 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved' (*Acts* xvi. 31).

Believe. That is all. *Crying*, or *praying*, or *doing* won't do. Only believe and thou shalt be saved. Believe *on* the Lord Jesus Christ. Not merely about Him.

Believe, and be *saved.* From all sin, and to eternal life. Believe now—there is no time for delay.

When Alexander encamped before a city, he used to set up a light, to give notice to those within that if they came forth to him while the light lasted, they should have quarter: if otherwise, no mercy was to be expected. God sets up light after light, waves His Flag of Mercy, and waits year after year, and even invites men to come unto Him, that they may have salvation and life, but often has to com-

plain, 'Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life' (*John* v. 40).

In the Preface to his book on *Teaching by Illustration* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net) the Rev. W. W. Moeran, M.A., says sensible things about the use of illustrations in the pulpit. And the most sensible thing he says is that our Lord's most sublime utterances were often made luminous to the simple-minded by the clear light of some beautiful emblem drawn from nature or human life. 'The common people heard him gladly.' And this, no doubt, was partly because He clothed His teaching in parables made attractive by their very homeliness. Almost everything He saw seemed to lend itself to the sacred purpose of His message.

He spoke of lilies, vines and corn,
The sparrow and the raven;
And words so natural yet so wise
Were on men's hearts engraven.

And yeast, and bread, and flax, and cloth,
And eggs, and fish, and candles—
See how the whole familiar world
He most divinely handles.

Mr. Moeran understands that not all good illustrations can be used. His are good, and they are all available. Here is one:

'During the "eighties," England was startled and many people were terrorized by a series of dynamite outrages perpetrated by a fanatical section of Irish Nationalists. At that time, Mr. James Monro, C.B., was Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police. He said to me one day, "We have had a most anxious time of it lately; frequent warnings reached us in Scotland Yard of violence, threatening the destruction of public buildings, and involving the loss of life. We have often been at our wits' end to know exactly when or where some fearful outrage with its wanton and cruel consequences might be successfully carried out. In weariness of heart, and almost in despair of disentangling the criminal net that was being so cunningly woven round the unconscious sleepers in the City, I have knelt down late at night in my office, and told the Lord all about it, praying to Him for guidance and wisdom. Then, the very next day perhaps, some intelligence would come in, putting us on the track of the criminals. People would read of the clever way in which the London Police had discovered the conspiracy just in time to avert some horrible deed of death and ruin. But they never knew, as I did, how much they owed, not only to the skill and courage of our brave police-force, but far more to the goodness and care of God who hears and answers prayer."'

Why does Canon C. D. H. McMillan call his volume of sermons *The Sleeping Cardinal* (Scott; 1s. 6d. net)? It is because in the beginning of the first sermon in it he speaks of the Church of Santa Maria del Popolo in Rome, and says:

'It was in this church that Martin Luther offered his first and last Mass in Rome. It is a most beautiful building, and is noted for the almost innumerable effigies and statues of departed popes and cardinals. There is a characteristic touch of life in most of these figures, which we generally find wanting in the colder and severer recumbent effigies of our northern clime. And there is one figure in which this characteristic is specially marked. It is the effigy of a cardinal in his robes, with a mitre on his brow, and a crosier in his hand at his side. The figure lies with the right side slightly raised, and this gives the impression that the sleeping cardinal is about to raise himself upon his elbow, and come forth into life.'

This is the way in which Canon McMillan preaches all his sermons. He has a picture in each, and round it the sermon takes its form and finds its appeal.

An expositor who is as faithful to his text and the laws of true interpretation as is the Rev. J. M. Witherow, M.A., is entitled to call his volume of expositions *Grapes of God* (Keighley: Wadsworth; 2s. net). In every exposition is to be heard the accent of the personally persuaded. 'I know,' says this author, as calmly as St. Paul.

The Rev. T. W. M. Lund, M.A., has published another volume of sermons preached by him in the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Hardman Street, Liverpool. He calls the volume *A Sower Went Forth* (Longmans; 5s. net). This is not the title of the first or of any other sermon in the volume. It describes the preacher of the sermons.

Some time ago Sir Oliver Lodge made copy for the newspapers by saying that in these days men do not worry about their sins. Mr. Lund does not agree. They do worry. But they have no

right to worry. There is nothing to worry about. The world is a very nice place, and God (for Mr. Lund believes in God) is a very nice God. He wants us all to be happy, and we are fools if we are sad. What makes people sad? This:

Nothing to breathe but air,
Nothing to eat but food,
Nothing to wear but clothes
To keep us from going nude.
Nothing to do but things;
Quick as a flash they've gone;
Nowhere to fall but off,
Nowhere to sit but on.
Nothing to quench but a thirst,
Nowhere to sleep but in bed,
Nothing to have but what we've got,
And no one to bury but dead.
Nothing to weep but tears;
Ah me, alack and alack!
Nowhere to go but out,
Nowhere to come but back.
Nothing to see but sights,
Never a gleam in the gloom;
Nothing but days and nights;
Oh for the rest of the tomb!
Nothing to comb but our hair,
Nothing to wed but a wife,
Only to suffer and bear;
What is the value of life?

What chances we miss, says Mr. Lund, when we go about with an undertaker's air, with a miserable, graceless soul stamped on a face, lined with its precise counterpart! The prettiest epitaph I know is in a New England cemetery, and it is very brief, but very pregnant: 'She was so pleasant.' What a picture it calls up of hearts comforted, loads lifted, weariness solaced, nerves soothed, lives strengthened, all because 'She was so pleasant!' There is another of a little girl: 'Her playmates said, It was easier to be good when she was with us.' Yet another in Père la Chaise: 'She loved and she was loved'—the inevitable complement. But don't let us wait for epitaphs. Let us copy the woman of whom it was asked why she was such a favourite, and the reply was, 'I suppose it is because she makes us all feel so nice.' You can't do that if you are one of the 'miserable sinners.' I like that turn to an old phrase; sinners because we are miserable, discontented, or dejected, when we ought to be doing our best to look pleasant, a habit which a little practice would help us all to acquire. That is, anyhow, a good way of entering into the joy of our Lord, and I commend it to all this Lent.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

The Morning of Life (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net) is the title which has been given by Dr. Barber, Headmaster of the Leys School, Cambridge, to a volume of Addresses to Boys. We strongly advise Sunday School superintendents and all others who have addresses to give to boys to buy the book. The best encouragement, perhaps, will be to quote one of the addresses. Here is an average example with an average number of illustrations.

The Enheartenment of Hope.

Never despairing—despairing of no man.—Lk 6^{35}.

Christ was an incurable optimist about mankind. He who knew most about man's sin, He who felt most keenly its agony and burden, was the very One who believed most in man's possibilities of response to holiness. And He bids us look at life in this spirit, always to believe the best possible, never to despair of any one. Later on, when Paul was seeking to sum up the characteristics of Christ's service, he wrote them down as Faith, Hope, Love. It is Faith—there is no despair there; Hope—the very antithesis of despair; and it is Love which covereth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Despair is utterly unchristian.

Man, what is this, and why art thou despairing? God shall forgive thee all but thy despair.

Do we not all know the value of an enthusiast? Have you not found him in your house life, in your school life, in your games? What life flows through the veins of all from one who enthusiastically refuses to believe in defeat, who assures the faint-hearted 'You can win'! The atmosphere of his cheeriness insensibly scatters clouds and braces the whole community. How often in the past have besieged garrisons and forlorn hopes owed everything to some incorrigible optimist who refused to see the dark side, and, by sheer force of hope, shamed men to dare and endure the impossible and to win!

I propose to-day to glance at one or two such strongholds of despair made strongholds of hope by the spirit of our text.

First, here is a holy city, but with its glory sullied and its very existence threatened. The insulting might of all Assyria is coming to crush Jerusalem. The numberless banners of Sennacherib's army are waving in the sunshine; the multitudinous tread of his armed hosts is thundering nearer and nearer. King and people alike are helpless; every face is pale with fear; men are going about the streets with downcast look and bowed head. For what can the tiny might of this capital of a little province do against the power of the world-empire? But, treading its streets with upright form and determined mien, is one whose very look heartens the people. Isaiah, prince and prophet, believes in the destiny of his city and his race. Does he not know their sin? None knows it better than he. When the right time comes, who can lash it more sternly than he? But after all it is the city of Jehovah. And, when the insulting message comes and Hezekiah dons sackcloth and lies prostrate before the Lord, it is Isaiah who gives the message. 'The virgin daughter of Zion shall laugh,' 'I will defend this city to save it for my own sake and for my servant David's sake, saith Jehovah.' Never a tremor of fear, only exultant strong faith in the city because it is God's. And men caught the contagion of hope, bent heads were raised, trembling voices tuned themselves to unfaltering praise; the whole city learned to believe in herself because there was one man in its midst who believed in her and her God. Calmly she waited. Then one night her foes were a mighty host; next morning 'they were all dead corpses.'

Next, it is the city of mankind, the race itself. It is fallen, hopeless. Never was the world's night darker. A great power was seated on the hills of Rome, and national existence was crushed flat beneath the weight of its rolling might. The old religions and the old freedoms were powerless, exploded forces; the whole head was sick, the whole heart was faint.

> On that hard pagan world disgust
> And secret loathing fell;
> Deep weariness and sated lust
> Made human life a hell.

The city of mankind was besieged by all manner of triumphant foes, and it had lost confidence in itself. Into the midst of this city there came the Son of Man, God Incarnate, and gave it new hope, new life, by believing in it. Did He not know its badness, its sin? None ever knew it so well, but He thought this poor world worth living for, worth dying for. Publican and sinner and harlot, scorned and living down to the level of scorn, those who had lost belief in themselves looked to Him—and lo! His words and looks all spoke to them of forgiveness and new life. And bowed backs were straightened, sour natures sweetened, downcast faces lifted up to heaven, sins cast out as unworthy because of the enthusiast who believed in them.

Do you remember Jean Valjean in Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables*, released convict, victim to sudden temptation, stealer of silver candlesticks, restored to his better self by the protecting love of the old Bishop who declared that the candlesticks had been his gift?

It is the world which sees the heap of refuse, and the one man who discerns the hidden radium worth a king's ransom; the world which scorns the filth after the gas has been extracted from the coal, and the one man who sees the beautiful aniline dyes.

A missioner once told me of an attempt to reach the poor lost women who are the victims of the selfishness and sin of the great city. A supper was given to a number of them, at which he was present, and pure women spoke to them and loved them. Not long after, the missioner was passing down one of the crowded streets and caught a glimpse of a face which he had seen, but could not exactly identify. With the natural instinct of good manners he raised his hat to the woman he saw. That very night a daughter of shame came imploring to a refuge. 'Mr. —— saw me and respected me, for he took off his hat to me. Oh, save me from the life I have been living!' It was months after before he knew—and then the soiled life was clean again.

So when Jesus Christ, who knew our sin, respected us and believed in us the whole sin-soiled, self-weary race gained new life, believed in itself—and all the Christian hope of the centuries was born.

Third, let us come to the city of your own life, the City of Mansoul. Your own life is before you. In a few days some of you, in a very few years all of you, will be leaving the shelter of school and will be taking your place in the great race of life. And at

the crisis many of you linger and shiver. How can you play your part well? How can you believe in yourself? There is only one way. Christ must come into your heart. Amidst the beleaguerment of sin and fear and diffidence He throws Himself into the citadel with His stores of hope and His good cheer. Does He not know your weakness and sin? It is just because of that that He comes. Have you often fallen, and therefore do you lose all confidence in yourself? He knows it all, and He says, 'I believe in you. I thought you worth dying for. You can do anything through Me who strengthen you.' Hence look forward to your own life and work with interest and enthusiasm. The one thing that is utterly hateful is cynicism, the spirit that sees no good in others and owns to no good in self.

But the life that admits the Lord and knows 'my Lord believes in me'—that life is set to high and noble music, where meanness is impossible, for the keynote is His love that gave the motto 'Never despairing—despairing of no man.'

Because of Thy strong faith, I kept the track
Whose sharp-set stones my strength had well-nigh spent;
I could not meet Thy eyes if I turned back:
So on I went.

Because Thou wouldst not yield belief in me,
The threatening crags that rose my way to bar
I conquered inch by crumbling inch—to see
The goal afar.

And though I struggle toward it through hard years,
Or flinch, or falter blindly, yet within,
'You can,' unwavering my spirit hears:
And I shall win.

II.

An attractive volume (attractive both without and within) of parables and pictures in prose has been published by the Rev. Bertram Pratt, M.A., under the title of *The Wingless Angel* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net). The parables and pictures are short; but here is one of the shortest.

The Other Victory.

Little Jimmy came home one day looking very glum. His side had lost the football match, but he had shared that experience before, and mere defeat hardly seemed sufficient to account for Jimmy's utter depression. Mother wisely made no comments, but waited for the situation to develop, and at last the tale of woe was told. 'Mother, God helped the bad boys and they won. Our side didn't get angry or use bad words, and we kept the rules, but the others swore and cheated, and they beat us by three goals to one. God must have been on their side, and I don't call it fair.' Ordinary comfort and explanation proved unavailing. The boys who had done right had been beaten by the boys who didn't care. God was on the side of might, not the side of right, and Jimmy continued to smart under the injustice. Presently father arrived home, and before Jimmy had seen him, mother took the precaution of explaining how matters stood. Father was thoughtful for a few moments, and then, calling Jimmy, said cheerily, 'Well, Jimmy, I hear you won all right to-day.' Mournful and tragic were the tones of Jimmy's voice as he replied, 'Well, you heard wrong, because we didn't.' 'Oh, but I heard there were two victories, and you won one.' 'But I don't know what you mean, daddy.' 'You see, mother told me all about it. She told me you lost the football match, but you won the bigger thing: you didn't win with your feet, but you won in your hearts, and conquered all the anger and cheating and bad language. You won after all, didn't you? I'm proud of you, my boy.' The clouds began to clear from Jimmy's face, and after a minute's thoughtful silence a much happier little boy said, 'I see now, daddy. God was on our side after all, wasn't He?' 'Jimmy,' answered his father, with a smile, 'there's a wonderful old Book which has this sentence in it—"Better is he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city." You ruled your spirit, kept your temper, and God helped you to win.' That night, when Jimmy knelt down to pray, he put these words on at the end of his prayer, 'Please, God, I'm sorry for the way I thought about You this afternoon. I didn't understand at first.'

III.

'The Battle of Life.'

'Fight the good fight.'—1 Ti 6^{12}.

Every boy and girl knows something about the terrible war that is going on at present—the greatest war in the history of the world. And I am sure you can all understand how cruel a thing war is

when you think of what has happened to Belgium. A few months ago the Belgians were safe and happy in their homes, and now thousands of them are homeless and destitute, many of the children having lost father and mother and all who cared for them. And in our own country, though we have not suffered so terribly, there are very many homes which have been saddened by the loss of dear ones killed on the field of battle. And war is cruel in many ways besides these. Yet from such a horrible thing as war we may learn some valuable lessons. For you know life is sometimes spoken of as a battle—the battle of life, we say.

1. Now if life is a battle, what does that mean? Well, it just means that there is some enemy we have to fight. 'An enemy?' you say. 'I have no enemy.' Listen. I know a little girl who one day broke a beautiful vase which her mother valued very much. When her mother asked her if she knew who had broken it, she thought to herself, 'I'll say No; mother will never find out. And if I said Yes I would be punished.' Ah! There was the enemy. And I believe you can all tell me his name; for I fear you have all been tempted, like that little girl, to tell a lie, or to do something else which you knew to be wrong. Yes, Satan is the enemy we have to fight, and the battle is sometimes a very hard one, even for young boys and girls like you.

2. Well, if we have to fight we must be soldiers. When there is a war we don't all go to fight, not even all our men. For some are too old, some too young, and some too weak. So the task of fighting is left to our brave soldiers and sailors, who risk their lives to keep us and our country safe. But in the battle of life, each one must fight—men and women, boys and girls, strong and weak alike. So, you see, we are really all soldiers. And if that is so, we must first of all be *obedient*. Just as the soldier on the field of battle must obey his commander, so we must obey that small voice within us called Conscience—you all know it, and have heard it speaking to you—which tells us, when we are tempted by our enemy, what is right and what is wrong. And then we must also be *brave*. Sometimes the general orders his soldiers to do a very hard thing, to meet a very fierce attack of the enemy. So also does Conscience sometimes tell us to do something that is very hard; and, like true soldiers, we must not shirk our duty, but must do it bravely, no matter what it costs us.

3. There is a word which I think must have become familiar to you all since this war began—the word 'allies'; and I expect you all know that the allies are the Belgians, French, Russians, and British, including our troops from India and the Colonies, and that they are so called because in this war they have agreed to fight together against the enemy, the Germans. That seems a strong force, and so it is—a force which we hope and believe will gain the victory in the end. But there is an Ally that has not been mentioned—the strongest of all—God. For we believe that we are fighting in a just cause, and that God, who is a God of justice, will help us so to fight that the enemy shall be overcome and the cause of justice and righteousness shall triumph. Now in our war against Satan we have no earthly ally, for each must fight his or her own battle. But we *must* have God for our ally, else we shall fight in vain. If we trust to our own strength we shall never be able to withstand the temptations with which Satan is ever ready to attack us.

4. There is another word which I should like to mention. You have all seen pictures of the soldiers digging trenches. These trenches are just very deep ditches in which the soldiers can lie, sheltered by the high ground in front, and escape the fire of the enemy. And so in our battle against Satan there are also trenches, as it were, behind which we can shelter ourselves. I shall mention three.

First of all, *good companions*. Now if you think of all the boys and girls you know, I am sure you can easily tell which of them would be good companions and which bad. Well, if you choose for *your* companions those who are good and true, you have a splendid 'trench' behind which to shelter. For one thing, you won't have so many temptations to face, and even when you are tempted you will find it is much easier to say No if you feel that your companions are sympathizing with you in your difficulty, and would say No if they were facing the same temptation. So be careful how you choose your companions.

Next, *good books*. When you read the story of a brave and honourable life, does it not make you wish to live as good and true a life? Read good books then, and try to follow the examples set forth in them. And above all, read the Bible, where you have the best example of all—the

example of Christ, who never yielded to temptation at all, who did no wrong, but gave Himself to death that He might save those who did. Surely that example should prove a sufficient shelter to you in whatever temptations may meet you.

Lastly, *prayer*. I have said that God is our Ally. That is true. God *is* our Ally; but if we are to obtain His help we must pray to Him for it, and trust that we will receive it. It is only to those who thus pray to Him and trust Him that God's strength is imparted. But to such it is never denied. And in that strength we shall be able to overcome all temptations, however hard, and shall at last enter Heaven victorious when life's battle is ended. Remember, therefore, always to pray.

These four things, then, the war may teach us: (1) that we have all a battle to fight; (2) that we must each fight our own battle; (3) that God is our Ally; and (4) that God's strength and help are to be obtained only by earnest and constant prayer.

IV.

Our Banner.

Jehovah-nissi—'The Lord is my banner.'—Ex 17^{15}.

My boys and girls, I am not going to preach to you about banners, or flags as we call them. You children of this generation have had reason to hear a very great deal about them, especially our Union Jack. You have got accustomed to seeing the Union Jack everywhere about—on the tops of houses, on motors, on bicycles, in button-holes; and I myself saw a great big, solemn, black dog with one over his back; he was collecting pennies for the Prince of Wales' Relief Fund.

As I said, I am not going to preach to you about flags. I shall just tell you a little story about the Union Jack, and how a boy was inspired by the sight of it. This boy's name was Charlie. He was eighteen, and nearly six feet high. Walking along Princes Street in Edinburgh one lovely autumn morning, he saw a procession of soldiers coming. He was in his working clothes, and he carried a long piece of iron, for Charlie was learning to be a working engineer. He stood up to watch the procession pass. First, there came what seemed to him a great many soldiers; then recruits followed. Some of these had not got their uniforms, and Charlie recognized two of his own friends amongst them. He saluted the two, and shouted, 'Hurrah! hurrah!' but they did not respond; they walked on with their heads in the air, looking very solemn. One of the other recruits, however, waved a Union Jack. Charlie had seen the flag often, and he knew all about what the three crosses meant; but there was something strange about this one. The little bit of cotton somehow seemed living as it fluttered in the wind. The sight of it sent a queer shiver down Charlie's back; he felt his legs shaking. 'Am I ill?' he asked himself, as he turned to go down Hanover Street, after all the men had passed, 'am I ill?' 'No,' he answered, 'I'm not ill. I'm a young recruit—a recruit in Lord Kitchener's Army. I know what the fellows meant now, when they said they couldn't do any work.'

The Union Jack—the Union Jack! It was flying from all the high buildings—Charlie saw nothing but the Union Jack. In the workshop that afternoon, there was the usual loud clanging of iron, and the sound of hammers. 'A lot of tin kettles,' he said to himself as he worked. On till it was time to stop work there rang in Charlie's ears, like the refrain of an old song—'I would sooner see this country of ours blotted out of the pages of history—I would sooner see this country of ours blotted out of the pages of history': just the same thing over and over again, for he did not remember any more of the great speech that some one had given him to read. But he knew and felt sure that the war was for a splendid cause.

How could he tell his mother? He couldn't at supper time—his father would be in the house then. Charlie was afraid of his father. Hadn't he told him over and over again, that he was scatter-brained, and would never be much good in this world? But Charlie spoke next morning. It was at breakfast-time. 'I'm not going back to my work,' he said suddenly. 'I'm going to offer myself for Kitchener's Army. I can't help it—I want to fight for the flag—for the cause. I would volunteer for Imperial Service, but I thought—I thought you would want me back.'

Charlie's cheeks were red; he had never delivered such a long speech in his life. The little kitchen—it suddenly seemed to have changed. The dresser—the dishes—they were the same, but everything had a different look—and his father—he seemed strange too. His eyes were bluer than Charlie had ever seen them. Would he speak? He did, at last. 'A lot of lazy louts—fanatics! Speak about the flag! If you would join—if you

would be a religious man, and serve under the banner of the Lord, your mother and me too would be better pleased.'

It was evening before his mother said anything. Then it was—'Charlie, it's hard, after I've brought you this length. The like of me—We're sometimes just driven to say, "God's will be done."'

'Mother,' he said, 'I can't help it. I must go. It's a great cause we're fighting for; I couldn't help going, even if you were never to speak to me again.' And Charlie went.

Hard work—drudgery—that was the daily story of camp life. One morning however, after what seemed to him a long time, he learnt that he had been drafted for Active Service. He could scarcely believe his ears. The Union Jack fluttered again—the great longing to help the cause re-awoke. In camp Charlie had been tempted to forget it sometimes.

Active Service meant weariness, cold, and sometimes hunger. But the boys knew what they were fighting for, and they believed in their officers—didn't they just? 'They never try to save themselves,' Charlie wrote to his parents. 'When I come home, I think you will both be proud that I have been in this great war. It is a fearful job, but we think of what it means, and, dear mother, nearly every man of us puts up some kind of prayer every night.'

Charlie never came home. He was one of a great many who were carried to the hospital one night, after a terrible day's fighting. 'Ugh,' he said, 'I'm not so badly hurt as you think. Give me a little time; I'll be at it again.' How well that nurse understood the boys!

'You're a bit tired, sonnie,' she said to Charlie as she went her rounds next morning.

'Yes,' and he spoke slowly; 'I don't really think that I'll get back to Auld Reekie, but I'm not giving in—mind that.'

'You want me to write a letter for you, don't you?' There she sat with her writing things ready.

'Yes. Nurse, how is it that you guess things? You're like a witch.'

'Now, I've begun,' she said—'"Dear Parents"'—

'"I doubt I will not see the old place again,"' Charlie dictated. "Tell George to get on with his trade. The Union Jack has the right side—I'm tired—I'm not able to say more." Nurse,' he said, 'I think maybe my mother would like a text; but I'm stupid, I can't remember a single one—yes, there's—"The Lord is my banner." If you write that text, I'll make a cross underneath it, for I'm not able to sign my name.'

'When I told him that the cross under the text was a beautiful idea, he looked as if he understood me.' So the kind nurse wrote home to his mother afterwards. And the night the letter came, Charlie's father gathered all his family together, and, without a break in his voice, but with great solemnity, read the verses that tell the story of our text—

'Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim. And Moses said unto Joshua, Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: tomorrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand.' (This rod was really the banner of the children of Israel; they felt inspired when they saw it, and were ready to fight with all their might.) 'So Joshua did as Moses had said to him, and fought with Amalek: and Moses, Aaron, and Hur, went up to the top of the hill. And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed. . . . And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword. And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi' (that is, 'the Lord is my banner').

'God forgive me,' he said afterwards, 'I have not been a praying man, as I should have been, but—do you know, mother, the young lads—and Charlie was amongst the best of them—they're teaching us a lesson. I never mind of a war like this. You would almost think we were living in Covenanting days.'

None of you boys are old enough to serve under the Union Jack, but boys and girls of you alike can enlist under the Banner of the Lord. Jesus Christ tried to teach men that there were other ways of meeting the foe than with those terrible weapons that men use. After nineteen hundred years, many of our leaders in this country are convinced of the same thing. They recognize the beauty of a law that respects the rights of the smallest of kingdoms, and that stands up for the weak against the oppression of the strong. For that cause they are fighting now. And, wonderful to tell, in the midst of the greatest war the world has ever seen, Jesus Christ is much in their minds. If He were coming to earth, do you think the leaders of our armies would say, as men said long

ago, 'Crucify Him'? No! I believe they would bow down before Him and say, 'Speak, Lord.'

To be under Christ's banner means a battle. You will have to defend your souls against evil. God has created you boys and girls for Himself, and not even the devil can bring evil upon your souls without your consent. Guard well, therefore, the gates that Bunyan speaks of in his wonderful allegory—*The Holy War*—ear-gate and eye-gate. You know how you may be tempted through things that you hear as well as through things that you see. When you pray to-night, say you want to be a recruit in the Army of Jesus Christ. If you are in earnest there will come, as there came to Charlie when he saw the Union Jack, a feeling that you are pledged to serve under the greatest of banners—the banner of the Lord. Think what it would mean if every boy and girl here did this. When the big brothers come home, fathers and mothers would lift their hearts in thankfulness even in the midst of their sorrow: the blessings that have followed all the loss and the misery of the war would be uppermost in their minds. Even now the thoughts of good fathers and mothers turn to the story of the Cross of Jesus Christ; they remember that through that darkest deed in the world's history there came our salvation.

Contributions and Comments.

Ἀγάπη.

By a curious coincidence, the day which brought from the publishers copies of our *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* brought what seems new light on the most crucial word we deal with. Like Deissmann before us, Dr. Milligan and I had to rewrite a hopeful account of *ἀγάπη*, evidence having turned up in the proof stage disposing of a 'profane' citation of the word. We called attention to the substitution of *ἀγάπη* for *ἀγάπηοις*, as a back-formation from *ἀγαπάω*; and we noted that it presumably arose in some limited area, and was subsequently taken up as a needed substantive answering to the verb. To-day in reading the LXX of the Elijah story with a class I have come upon the nouns *συναντήν* (3 K 18^{16} also 4 K 2^{15} 5^{26}) and *ἀπάντην* (3 K 20^{18}). Conybeare and Stock remark that A substitutes *συνάντηοιν*, as also *ἀπάντηοιν* in the last-named passage. Now *ἀντάω* is as little derived from '*ἀντή*' as *ἀγαπάω* from *ἀγάπη*, and it is clear that both groups must be explained in the same way. The interest of this parallel lies in the fact that the new nouns *συναντή* and *ἀπαντή* are still more restricted than *ἀγάπη*, being found only in the translator of 3 and 4 K. Perhaps some other instances of this dialectic tendency may be found if we look further.

James Hope Moulton.

Didsbury College.

Salt.

Your note as to the impossibility of finding a connexion between the three utterances concerning 'salt' in Mk 9^{49} is so important, and the connexion or want of connexion implies so much, that I venture to make a suggestion. While admitting the verbal connexion between this and the preceding verses by the catchword 'fire,' I suggest that there is also a connexion of thought, and that the words were spoken by our Lord Himself in the order in which they are recorded by St. Mark, and that they embody a faithfully remembered transcript from the notes taken at what I venture to call the catechetical lectures given by the Apostles in Jerusalem, summed up as the doctrine or teaching of the Apostles (Ac 1^{42}). Not only is 'fire' the connecting word between v.^{42} and those which precede it, but the symbolic meaning of 'fire' indicates a profound revelation concerning the conditions of the future world, both in regard to the awful penalty for obstinate sin, and in regard to that corrective experience to which the best of departed souls must be subjected. This is implied by the word Κόδαοις, or corrective punishment, used in the description of the judgment scene (Mt 25^{46}). Fire, then, is the symbolic equivalent of Κόδαοις, and the fire that shall never be quenched is corrective punishment that fails. The figure is, of course, taken from the purifying fires of the Valley of Hinnom, and the fire is never quenched because

the corruption is never overcome, the need of purification is always there. Such is the case of the persistent sinner who refuses to repent and cast away temptation, or, in the language of symbolism, to cut off offending hand or foot. The flame of purification persists because the need of it remains. Corrective punishment is inoperative and the end is eternal condemnation.

With v.[49] another symbol is introduced, but the same line of thought continues. Salt is also a purifying element. It is good; and to be 'salted with fire' is to be purified by correction. This is to be the experience of every one. The holiest fall short of perfectness. But 'if the salt have lost its savour wherewith will ye season it?' That is, if the purifying influence is inoperative, as it would be in the case of a heart hardened against repentance, nothing can avail. Again the only end can be eternal condemnation. 'Therefore,' says Christ, 'have salt in yourselves,' which is only another way of saying, 'If thy foot offend thee, or cause thee to be tempted, cut it off'; the concluding words, 'and be at peace one with another,' referring back to the contention (v.[34]) from which the whole discourse originated.

A. Carr.

Addington Vicarage, Croydon.

Destroying and Rebuilding the Temple.

In the Fourth Gospel we find only one mention made of any prediction by Jesus of His resurrection from the dead within three days, and that too in very ambiguous terms, which are susceptible of a quite different interpretation. This is the alleged statement that Jesus, after driving the sellers of sacrificial beasts out of one of the Temple courts together with their live-stock, dismissing more mildly the vendors of doves, and upsetting the tables of the money-changers, was asked by 'the Jews' (*i.e.* apparently, Judeans as contrasted with Galileans and Samaritans), 'what sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?' (Jn 2[18]). To which the Master replied, 'Pull down this temple, and in three days I will raise it.' Thereupon, the evangelist tells us, the Jews said, 'It took forty-six years for this temple to be built, and wilt thou raise it in three days?' No answer to this taunt seems to have been vouchsafed by Jesus, whose custom it never was to explain His 'hard' sayings to the malevolently contemptuous. Many of them are disputed to this day, even when spoken to His own disciples, like His dictum on divorce or His mystical words at the Last Supper which have furnished the basis for endless controversy. In this case, however, an explanation is given by the narrator of the interview; that Jesus 'spoke concerning the temple of his body,' and that the disciples remembered this saying after His resurrection from the dead. If authentic (and three out of the four evangelists refer to some such saying as having been uttered by our Lord) this cryptic utterance may with some plausibility be connected with another incident recorded only in the same Gospel, when Jesus told the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, 'The hour cometh when neither on this mountain' [Gerizim, the site of the Samaritan temple], 'nor in Jerusalem, will ye worship the Father. . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth' (Jn 4[21. 23]). The great Speaker of parables may well have had this vision of transformed Judaism before His eyes at this very time—only a few days before the interview at the well, according to the chronology of the Fourth Gospel—and the evangelist himself may have had at the back of his mind that figurative meaning among Christians of 'the body of the Lord' (1 Co 12[27]) and 'the temple of God' (1 Co 3[16. 17]) as the whole body of believers, when he commented upon the Saviour's words. As to the expression 'in three days' for an indefinitely short time, compare Hos 6[2] ('After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him') with Mt 16[21], etc.

This cleansing of the Temple in so drastic and even violent a manner, unlike the characteristic 'meekness and gentleness of Christ' (2 Co 10[1]), is here represented as carried out at the beginning of Christ's career as a public teacher. But a proceeding almost precisely similar is related in the first two Gospels at the very end, in the last week, of His earthly life (Mt 21[12. 13], Mk 11[15-17]; cf. Lk 19[45. 46]), except that no mention is made of a scourge of cords, and that the mild remonstrance 'make not my Father's house a house of merchandise' (Jn 2[16]) becomes a much stronger rebuke, based on passages from Isaiah (56[7]) and Jeremiah (7[11]), in which He charges the traffickers with being actual 'robbers.' He is not expressly said to have

uttered on that occasion the words attributed to Him in the Fourth Gospel, which are, however, repeated as a charge against Him, in somewhat different language, by 'false witnesses' (Mk 14^{57}) on the night of His examination before the high priest. According to Mark's report the words were said to have been, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands' (Mk 14^{58}). In Matthew's Gospel He is stated to have said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days' (Mt 26^{61}). To this evidence Jesus refused to make any reply, probably as being substantially correct, at least so far as the latter clause was concerned; and it was only when pressed to give an answer whether He were the Christ, that he affirmed that He was so indeed, and identified Himself with Daniel's description of the Son of Man coming with (Mk 14^{62}) or on (Mt 26^{64}) the clouds of heaven (Dn 7^{13}). The animosity of the Sadducean party (who were closely connected with the priesthood) had been very recently inflamed against Him, as it would seem, by what they deemed to be a presumptuous and arrogant interference with the profitable trade carried on in the Temple precincts, and certain words which sounded like sacrilegious threats mixed up with blasphemous self-assertion had been heard by several persons. Mark's version of the incriminating language is probably nearest to the truth, for the reference to a temple made without hands seems remarkably characteristic. The evidence (said to be suborned) against the proto-martyr Stephen as given in Acts 6^{11-14} corroborates this view: 'This man ceaseth not to speak words against this holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us.' Moreover, in his defence, Stephen lays emphasis upon the Temple being a man-made structure: 'Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands' (Ac 7^{47-50}), and quotes the prophet Isaiah to that effect.

On the whole, then, we may conjecture that the Fourth Gospel furnishes a later and less accurate account of the words which Jesus used in the Temple a few days before His arrest. Here, in St. John, the whole incident occurs at the outset instead of at the close of His career, and it can at the present day scarcely be believed by the most credulous harmonizer of the Gospels that all the circumstances repeated themselves after an interval of three years. The prediction of His own resurrection from the dead after three days, recognized only after the event (Jn 2^{22}), may have coloured the precise language ('destroy' for 'I will destroy' or 'I can destroy') and made it more applicable to that interpretation; though a certain statement in the First Gospel is of importance in this connexion (Mt 27^{63}), 'We remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I rise again.' But it is strange that His bitterest enemies should have rightly understood the meaning of a prediction which the apostles themselves failed to comprehend at the time it was uttered (Mk 9^{32} and parallel passages) when expressed in unambiguous terms.

ROBERT BRUCE BOSWELL.

Bassett.

The Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke xv. 11–32).

WE read in v.[19] that 'when he came to himself this son determined to make confession to his father and ask 'make me as one of thy hired servants.' But when he has met—or rather, is met by—his father and makes the confession (v.[21]), there is no mention of the request. Why is this omitted by him?

One answer is that his father stopped him. This explanation seems to be excluded by the story: for the father speaks, not to him, but to the servants.

Another answer is that he saw in his father's welcome the assurance of something better than the bread 'enough and to spare' of the hired servant. I do not think this either is quite satisfactory. For we see in the two preceding parables that the loss and the recovery are both complete; and just as with the 'sheep' and the 'coin' there, so here with the son: he 'was dead, and is alive again; was lost, and is found.' In the light given by this explanation I cannot see that he is 'found,' certainly he is not 'alive again.' It shows selfishness, content where its own immediate wants are satisfied, but an utter absence of the filial longing of a *son* 'found' and 'alive.'

May not these last words give us the true reason? Filial affection must have been atrophied in him when he could leave his father's home (no

longer his), to go 'into a far country': dignity is gone when he could 'feed swine'; and his misery is complete when he is perishing with hunger. He is quite 'lost.' What he feels is the hunger; what he wants is the bread of which there is sufficiency in his 'father's house.' When he has received his father's kiss he sees that this craving is satisfied; but does not this kiss create a new want in his heart? Is not the 'dead' sonship now 'alive again' in him? Would not the words 'make me as one of thy hired servants' on his lips be denied by his heart? Sonship is awakened by the father's forgiving love, and, however unworthy of it, only the place of a son in his father's house and in his father's heart will satisfy him.

The story is repeated in every conversion. The need of forgiveness is first felt; when God's forgiving mercy in Christ is realized, then comes the yearning for sonship, to be a child of God, and so to have 'fellowship with God.'

W. Gray Williams.

Liverpool.

Entre Nous.

The report on prayers received will be made next month.

The offer is made of a complete set (20 vols.) of *The Great Texts of the Bible* (or the equivalent in other books chosen from T. & T. Clark's Catalogue) for the best series of illustrations from the War, suitable for pulpit or platform. The illustrations should be sent in February.

Angelus Silesius.

Mr. Henry Bett has translated a selection from *The Spiritual Maxims of Angelus Silesius* (Kelly; 6d. net). He has also written an Introduction to the maxims, in which he tells the ignorant among us who Angelus Silesius was. We quote two of the maxims:

Each must be a Christ.

The very Son of God is Christ, and only He:
Yet every Christian himself a Christ must be.

The Dead Will.

When once my will is dead, then God must do my will,
And I prescribe for Him that which He must fulfil.

Paul Carus.

Dr. Paul Carus, the Editor of *The Open Court*, is always interested in the things that are fundamental. In his poetry he writes on truth, time, love, the nature of things, death. We should have been surprised if he had written on smaller things than these. The surprise is, however, that he can write poetry at all. For he has written many books of science. Evidently he is one of the few who take care that their nature is not atrophied on the one side and hypertrophied on the other, to use Dr. Havelock Ellis's description. Here are a few lines from the poem on Death. The title of the book is *Truth, and Other Poems* (Open Court Pub. Co.; $1).

When we have tasted of the zests of life,
Breathed in the bracing air of comprehension,
Enjoyed the pleasures of accomplishment,
When we have felt the glow of happiness,
The thrill of love, of friendship, of endeavor,
When we have borne the heat of day and sweated
Under the burden of our tasks, we shall,
Wearied of life's long drudgery, be glad
To sink into the arms of sleep, to rest
From all our labors, while our work lives on.
As at the end of day we greet the night,
So we shall tire of duties, pains and joys
And gladly quaff the draught of Lethe's cup.

Persia and the Bible.

A volume of *Bible Illustrations from Persia of To-day* has been prepared by the Rev. Edward J. Clifton, M.R.A.S., late of the C.M.S., Shiraz, Persia (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d.). The subjects are arranged alphabetically. Sometimes the illustration throws unexpected light upon the language of the Bible. For example:

Place Empty.

When Jonathan made his solemn compact with David, he told the latter that Saul would hold a sacred feast on the day of the new moon. There and then said Jonathan to David, 'thou shalt be missed, because thy seat will be empty' (1 Samuel xx. 18). A similar phrase appears again a few verses further on in the same chapter, where we are told that 'the king sat upon his seat, as at the other times, even upon a seat by the wall: and Jonathan arose, and Abner sat by Saul's side, and David's place was empty' (1 Samuel xx. 25). This identical expression is in constant use among the Persians to-day, both in speaking and in writing. It is quite customary, and also polite, when remarking upon the absence of a person from any gathering or assembly, to say in complimentary terms, 'your place was very empty,' meaning thereby that such an one was greatly missed. The same sentence is of frequent occurrence in letters, where it is employed to show how much a person's presence is missed by the writer, who, in expressing the desire to see the absent one again with all speed, invariably adds the compliment, 'for your place has become very empty.'

Elizabeth Gibson Cheyne.

Mrs. Cheyne of Oxford is known as the author of many volumes of lyric verse. She is also known as a prose poet. Following her book entitled *The Voice of One Crying* (which was arranged in cycles by Professor T. K. Cheyne), she has issued *The Man with the Mirror* (A. & C. Black; 2s. 6d. net). One full example of the manner of it will suffice:

A Brother.

I was walking through the wilderness; and I heard a woman say: 'Blessed be the holy bond between brother and sister; for my brother has been to me not only brother, but father and mother and sister. He has descended into the Valley of the Shadow, and has carried me thence. He has fed me sacramentally with patience and with tenderness, in hours of agony, when every movement was a cry. He has sacrificed daily on the altars of my sorrows with reverence and with pity; and he has never turned away his face from me in any time of tribulation, nor ever refused sympathy in any day of joy. He has shared his friends with me; and if his friends have forsaken me, he has forsaken neither me nor them. He has shared with me all love, all skill, all heavenly wisdom, all knowledge and all beauty, all wonder and all glory. He has led me from misery to forgetfulness, and from the sombre forest of death into the cheerful fields of life. He has placed me beside him on the throne of his dreams in the hours of his triumphs; and there evermore he keeps a place for me, which he offers to none other, and which none other invades. Blessed be the holy bond between brother and sister!' And I saw the woman lie down to sleep in peace.

Grace.

Faith's Certainties, by J. Brierley, B.A. (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). This is the last volume that we shall receive from the J.B. of *The Christian World*. There are those we know who have the whole series of books—a long series it is—and speak of them affectionately. The last volume is not less stimulating, not less loyal, not less hopeful, than any of the volumes that went before it. The subjects are old and new, but always fresh. Had he lived twice his long age, and written twice the number of books he did, Brierley would no doubt have found fresh topics to the end. For it is not the subject that makes the attractive essay; it is its treatment, it is the person behind it.

One of the papers in this volume is on Grace. 'For long ages past,' says Mr. Brierley, 'theology has appropriated this word, and in the handling has warped, disfigured and degraded it.' He says it is the most ill-used word in the language. As a good Congregationalist he finds it has been ill-used on the one hand by the Episcopalian. 'Ask a Scotchman,' he says, 'brought up on the Westminster Catechism, what is meant by "the doctrines of grace," and his mind goes back to decrees of predestination, of election, of reprobation, of final perseverance; to a system of belief which makes humanity the subject of a fate which, before they were born, secured for a favoured number of them an everlasting salvation, and condemned the rest to a certain damnation. Ask the Catholic, Roman or Anglican, what is meant by grace, and he tells you of something which reaches you through a rigidly protected and exclusive system of sacraments. You are saved from wrath by baptism, by the Communion, administered to you by a priest. The priest is thus empowered by his ordination. This ordination has become valid

by being received at the hands of a bishop, and the bishop's power is derived from an unbroken apostolic succession. Grace, in this view, is a something whose communication suggests a system of pipes, as though it were Standard oil—the strict monopoly of a caste. On all sides of the Church grace has been construed in terms of exclusion, with a menace behind it, like a flash of light on a thundercloud.'

What, then, is the meaning of the word, according to a good Congregationalist? Brierley goes back to the Greeks. To the Greeks grace was beauty, showing itself in loveliness of form, reaching its highest physical ideal in the human form, and moulded there, in its truest examples, by an inner nobleness of soul. And this beauty was divine; in its essence it was life's highest expression; its true home was the nature and beauty of God.

Then he asks, Has religion bettered it? Grace is the beauty of God; the beauty of His character. And its action upon us is the outgoing of that beauty. Grace in ourselves, religious grace, is just the reflexion of that beauty in our own heart and life. And if we take our doctrine of grace from the New Testament, instead of from the systems into which its words have been tortured, we shall find nothing there that is contrary to this, its first high meaning. It is there the nature of God, flowing out upon us, freely giving itself, winning us by the exhibition of its beauty, and producing in us, so far as we receive it, a growing approximation to its own perfectness.

The Ka.

Professor Flinders Petrie has issued the fourth part of his quarterly review entitled *Ancient Egypt* (Macmillan; 2s.). It opens with an article by Professor Sayce on 'The Biscuit or Egg-shell Ware of the Sudan and China,' which is illustrated. This is followed by an article for the more learned Egyptologists by Professor P. E. Newberry on 'Udymu and the Palermo Stone.' After a note on 'The Coptic Stele of Apa Teleme,' there comes the longest article in the number, a continuation of Professor Petrie's 'Egypt in Africa.' Among other things this article contains an explanation of the Egyptian *ka*, the meaning of which has been so long and so keenly debated. We learn from the African beliefs that the *ka* was 'an ancestral emanation indwelling in each man, sent by the ancestor who was in the future world, and to whom the man would go at his death.' Among the reviews there is a very appreciative notice of Professor Wiedemann's article in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS on 'Incarnation (Egyptian).'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Ernest Drew, New Cross Wesleyan Methodist Church, London, S.E.

Illustrations of the Great Text for January must be received by the 20th of November. The text is Phil 4^{19}.

The Great Text for February is Ro 8^{28}—'And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose.' A copy of any volume of the *Great Texts of the Bible*, or of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for March is Ro $7^{24.25}$—'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for April is Ac 26^{28}—'And Agrippa said unto Paul, With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian.' A copy of Law's *The Tests of Life*, or of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, and Shaw's *Christianity as Religion and Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for May is Phil 2^{5-8}—'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of Lithgow's *The Parabolic Gospel*, and Coats's *The Christian Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'No one cometh unto the Father, but by me.' What, then, are we to do with *The Autobiography of Maharshi Devendranath Tagore*? (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net).

The Autobiography has been edited by one of his sons—not the poet, but Satyendranath TAGORE, with assistance from Indira DEVI. There is no difficulty there. The editing is done with judgment and piety. The book, as an Autobiography, and as the Autobiography of the Founder of an Indian Sect, has all the interest we expect to find in it. The difficulty is with the Introduction.

For in the Introduction, which is written by Miss Evelyn UNDERHILL, it is claimed for TAGORE that he was a true mystic, and for his Autobiography that it is going to take its place among 'the few classic autobiographies bequeathed to us by certain of the mystics and saints.' TAGORE is placed beside Suso, Madame Guyon, 'even the great St. Teresa herself.' And his book is said to be 'essentially of the same class as the *Testament* of Ignatius Loyola, the *Journal* of George Fox.'

Now we are not about to deny this estimate. On the contrary, there seems to be evidence enough within the book to satisfy any reader that TAGORE was a true mystic. No doubt it is very mixed. There are details of private, family, and commercial life which must be regarded as questionable contributions to the history of Mysticism. But these details only serve to throw the genuinely mystical writing into prominence. It is with something like a thrill of joy that we pass out of the history of the liturgy that was planned for the Brahma-Samaj into the twelfth chapter. That chapter is short enough and great enough to be worth complete quotation.

'Formerly when I used to see people worshipping factitious and finite gods in their petty shrines, I thought to myself, When shall I see my own Infinite God face to face in the temple of this universe and adore Him? This desire was then burning in my heart night and day. Waking or asleep, this was my one wish, my only thought. Now, having seen in the heavens this radiant and immortal Being, all my desires were fulfilled, and all my torment was at an end.

'I was satisfied with getting so much, but He was not content with giving so little. Hitherto He had existed beyond and outside myself; now He revealed Himself within me, I saw Him within my soul. The lord of the world-temple became the lord of my heart's shrine, and from thence I began to hear silent and solemn religious teachings. Fortune favoured me beyond all my expectations. I received more than I had ever hoped for, and scaled mountains, cripple though I was. I had

not known how boundless was His mercy. The craving I had felt when seeking for Him increased a hundred-fold now that I had found Him. The little that I now see of Him, the little of His voice that I can hear, is not enough to assuage my hunger and thirst. "The more you feed, the greater the greed."

'"O my Lord! now that I have seen Thee, reveal Thyself to me more vividly. I have been blest by hearing the sound of Thy voice, pour out its sweet strains more and more honeyed. Let Thy beauty appear before me under ever-changing forms. Now Thou appearest to me and disappearest like a flash of lightning; I cannot retain my hold on Thee. Do Thou dwell for ever in my heart." Whilst saying these words the light of His love found its way into my heart like the rays of the morning sun. Without Him I had been as one dead, with a void in my heart, plunged in the darkness of despondency. Now, at the rising of the sun of love, life was infused into my heart, I was awakened from my deep slumber, the gloom of sadness was dispelled. Having found God, the current of my life flowed on swiftly, I gained fresh strength. The tide of my good fortune set in. I became a pilgrim on the path of love. I came to know now that He was the life of my life, the Friend of my heart; that I could not pass a single moment without Him.'

Who doubts the mysticism of that chapter? Who says that TAGORE has not come to the Father? But what do we find when we turn the page?

When we turn the page we find the bitterest hatred expressed for Christianity, and the most malignant device conceived and fulfilled for the express purpose of 'stemming the tide of Christian conversion' and delivering 'a serious blow to the cause of the missionaries.'

The relation of Mysticism to Christ has not yet been faced by Christian Mystics. Its importance has not been realized. Its urgency has not been admitted. The Ritschlians certainly have not allowed it to be overlooked. But even the Ritschlians have been unable to compel the Mystics to see that no one comes to the Father but by Jesus Christ, and no one has communion with the Father who has not communion also with the Son.

The Rev. W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., has much sympathy with the Mystics. He was chosen to deliver the 'Baird Lecture' for 1913, and made *Christian Freedom* its subject. He has now published the lecture under that title (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It was impossible that so scholarly and so Christian a lecturer, urging the necessity of man's individual approach to God, should either fail to appreciate the approach of Mysticism, or should miss the importance of making that approach through Christ. In the middle of the book there occurs a characteristically searching discussion of the attitude of the Mystic to the Christ of the Gospels.

Dr. MACGREGOR does not deny that there has been a Mysticism even in Christianity which has dropped out of sight the Lord Jesus Christ and His gospel. Its God is so independent of the human, so anxious to avoid the suspicion of anthropomorphism, that we are reminded of the original chaos, which was without form and void. 'We know not,' says Clement of Alexandria, 'what He is but what He is not. He has absolutely no predicates, no genus, no differentia, no species. He is formless and nameless, and though we sometimes give Him titles, they are not to be taken in the ordinary sense.' A much greater man than Clement exhibits in his *Confessions* the same type of formless apprehension. In one famous passage, Augustine speaks of himself as 'attaining with the flash of one hurried glance to the vision of *That which is*.' Nothing, it seems, could safely be affirmed of God in that moment except His existence; He has no character, no attributes, and those who come to

His presence are conscious of nothing but His infinite Being. Even in the immortal scene at Ostia the same defect appears. He and his mother, hand in hand, 'climbed by the staircase of the spirit, thinking and speaking of Thee,' and as they 'talked and yearned after it, they touched it for an instant with the whole force of their hearts.'

This is a risk that the Mystic has always run. Dr. MACGREGOR discovers the tendency to conceive of God as without form even in the Old Testament. Indefiniteness, he says, is there almost the mark of a vision of God; men's terror would not suffer them to look, and all that they were conscious of was a dazzling Brightness without features. When Jacob at Peniel presses his opponent for his name, he is answered: 'Why askest thou of my name, seeing it is secret?' As soon as Isaiah began to see (6^4), 'the house was filled with smoke,' and the vision was obscured. Ezekiel, in shy ways, would like to push the matter further and give God human affinities (*e.g.* 1^8: so 1^{10}—the forward looking face in the cherubim is the man's face, not the lion's or the eagle's); but again and again the feeling recurs in him that human words are inapplicable, and at his boldest he can only say, 'Upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man' (1^{26}).

But Dr. MACGREGOR is convinced that this is not Christian. In the Old Testament there was no way of combating the ever-insistent anthropomorphism of the popular conception of God than by depriving Him of all that by which He can be known and loved. But when Jesus came as the Word made flesh, and bringing salvation, a new Mysticism became possible. Men gathered boldness in their approach to the Holiest. They reached heights of rapturous devotion never surpassed before. Their highest vision is gained through faith in Christ, and as they mount towards God they never leave behind the Lamb of God.

This is not true, as we have seen, of all those who in the history of the Church have been called Mystics, or it is not true of them always. But it is always true of some. Dean INGE reports of that great mystic — Juliana of Norwich — that 'the crucified Christ is the one object of her devotion. She refused to listen to a voice which said: "Look up to heaven to His Father" . . . "I cared for none other heaven than Jesus, which shall be my bliss when I come there."' Madame PÉRIER, summarizing her brother Pascal's opinion, says: 'The Christian man's God is the God of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, a God of love and consolation. . . . He is not simply God, He is a God who restores (*un Dieu réparateur*).' The accuracy of that summary is established beyond question by the 'Amulet' itself. Like Augustine, in a flash of trembling vision (*ictu trepidantis aspectus*) Pascal had attained to the sight of God, and his life had been transformed; but what he saw was not bare being, it was character, it was mercy, it was individualizing friendship.

When the Christian Mystic forgets to be Christian, Dr. MACGREGOR believes that he is under the influence of Eastern speculation. His Mysticism is Mysticism 'bleached and impoverished by Asiatic influences.' Says Mr. CHESTERTON: 'It was a mark of the old Eastern initiations, as it still is a mark of the grades and planes of our theosophic thinkers, that as a man climbs higher and higher, God becomes to him more and more formless, ethereal, and even thin.' But Christianity, which is neither of East nor West, confronts the Oriental with its resolute assertion of personality; and in the Christian Mysticism of which Paul was the great originator, the image of Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, retains the central place.

In the life of Adèle KAMM, a translation of which has been published with the title *A Living Witness* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), the problem of pain is thrust before our face. It is thrust before our face in such a way that we feel bound to

come to some conclusion about it. We need not rebel. The problem is in the world in any case. We see very little if we do not see that it is the presence of pain in the world that accounts for half of its unbelief. It will be well for us, and it will be well for others through us, if we are driven by such a book as this to seek a solution of the problem that will allow us to keep our faith in God.

Two possible solutions are suggested by this book. One was found by Adèle Kamm herself. The other is the solution of Madame Flournoy. 'The sight of the dumb agony of a few shell-fish, left stranded on the shore by the receding tide, and slowly scorching to death in the sunshine, made such a profound impression upon a sensitive, thoughtful woman, Mme. Théodore Flournoy, that she began to doubt the all-pervading goodness of that Providence of whom Racine speaks in the following terms:—

By God's provision new-born birds are fed,
And o'er all nature is His kindness spread.'

'Why is it?' she mused, 'that this Beneficent Power which broods over Nature is everywhere found lacking? Why does He permit so much cruelty, so many horrors, so much useless suffering?'

Some time later a terrible tragedy occurred at a sanatorium in Leysin. It sometimes happens at the beginning of tubercular trouble that there is so much nervous excitement as to lead to entire lack of self-restraint. One day a physician at Leysin, Henry Burnier, an able and devoted man, was shot by a patient. Dr. Burnier was Madame Flournoy's brother. She could not see the hand of God in the event.

When in the shadow plots the murderous heart,
Is Thy pure will at work within his hate?
When battle-fields are swept and desolate
And ships return no more, hast Thou a part?

So she sang. It was her sweetest song, and it tells of saddest thought.

What conclusion did she come to? She came to the conclusion that all evil—pain and disease and death—is the doing, not of God but of the Devil. Jesus seemed to her to say so. It was the only solution she could see her way to. God, she concluded, was often present with the world and all went well; but sometimes He was absent from it, and then the Devil had his way with it, and pain and disease and death came.

The *Recollections of Marie Flournoy-Burnier* (1856–1909) were printed for private circulation, and a copy was sent to Adèle Kamm. She did not agree. She too had felt the pressure of the pain of the world. In her own person she had experienced it. For some years she had been slowly dying in suffering, often the most acute that can be endured. She had had the problem of suffering thrust upon her in its most merciless aspect. And she had solved it. The solution that she found was that God is never absent, but always very near and very loving. She concluded once for all that all the suffering that there is in the world is sent by God to make us good.

It certainly made Adèle Kamm good. That one fact the biography establishes. It was said of the Master that He went about doing good. Of Adèle Kamm it could be said that she lay in bed doing good. And she owed her influence for good to her illness. She knew that she owed it to her illness. She said so over and over again. And it was not in spite of the illness, but because of it, that she said, very simply and sincerely, near the end, 'I *have* had a happy life.'

Her suffering made her good. And goodness with her was an active ever-giving thing. 'Invalids,' she said, 'have a much greater influence than people who are well. They have many more ways of helping others; I am sure it is so from my own sweet and happy experience.'

And this not only solved the problem of her own suffering; it solved also the same problem

when the suffering falls on others. Madame Flournoy might have been sanctified by suffering and so found that it came from God if it had been her own. When it was the suffering of others, all she could do was to attribute it to the Devil. Adèle Kamm looked upon the suffering of others as if it *were* her own. She suffered in their suffering. She suffered a vicarious suffering on their behalf. And so she was able to believe that 'all is of God who is and is to be, and God is good.'

'I fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church.' So said St. Paul. Adèle Kamm took 'the Church' in the widest sense. It covered for her the whole of regenerate humanity, and, writing to a friend, she said, 'For a long time now I have cherished, deep down in my heart, a certain conviction, which, though at first somewhat vague and elusive, has become clearer during the last two years, and is really the source of all the joy which I experience in my affliction. I believe that suffering, accepted with submission, may be a means of great blessing to us; but I also believe that we may go a step further, and that by the voluntary acceptance of our cross in the Spirit of Christ (that is, in union with the Will of God) we may help, in some measure, to bring about the final victory of good over evil. This ultimate triumph of Goodness, foretold in the New Testament, and confirmed by all the highest aspirations of our spiritual nature, is an aim so beautiful and sublime that the thought that we may hasten the final destruction of sin by the glad and willing uniting of our sufferings with those of the Master is an incredibly powerful motive and inspiration, as I am finding out, to my great joy, every day I live.'

Perhaps the most striking thing in this remarkable experience is the fact that she found it necessary to take in Christ. Throughout her illness, and even after she saw that she too was filling up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ, her thoughts were not of Christ but of God, and the love she gave so lavishly was given to God, and not to Christ. 'You do not know,' she said to one of the most intimate of her friends, 'you do not know how much you have helped me. I knew very well that your spiritual life centred in God rather than in Christ before you told me so. It is this inward attitude of yours which makes me love you better than others, and I used to have the same feeling about Lily Schlumberger; whereas, in spite of everything, I do not feel the same sense of fellowship with those who see Christ *only*, and who so easily become narrow-minded.'

Her fellowship was with the Father, and with the Father only. But she found that the problem of suffering cannot be solved apart from Christ. 'During these last few months I have been in constant communion with God, receiving from Him all the strength and wisdom I need for my work, but I had insensibly drifted away from Christ. That did not, however, disturb me at all, for I remembered the words, "I and the Father are One." Then it seemed as though a veil were being drawn around my spirit, dimming the spiritual brightness in which I lived. I found that I had lost something of the sweetness of inward peace, something of the luminous radiance of vision which I used to possess, and I vaguely wondered why it was! But when I was writing the letter to the prisoners, which, as I told you, brought me into such close touch with Christ, I was astonished to find that everything grew bright again. The mists were dispelled, and now I am once more on the mountain-top, daily rejoicing in the clear sunshine of His Love and Peace. So I have discovered that the blessings and influence which flow from God and from Christ are different in character, and that we need to pray to both sides of God, if I may put it so, if our spiritual hunger is to be satisfied. I am glad to have made this discovery for myself, for I like to found my faith on actual experience rather than on any kind of dogma.'

Maurice MAETERLINCK'S new book, *The Unknown Guest* (Methuen; 5s. net), contains five essays. One is on 'Phantasms of the Living and the Dead,' one on 'Psychometry,' one on 'The Knowledge of the Future,' one on 'The Unknown Guest,' and one on 'The Elberfeld Horses.'

One essay is on 'The Elberfeld Horses.' MAETERLINCK believes in the Elberfeld Horses. He went to Elberfeld and put them to all the tests he could invent, and came away without the shadow of a doubt. And yet the more he tested them the greater was his astonishment. In his presence they added, they subtracted, they multiplied, they extracted roots, they heard questions and answered them, all with the beat of the hoof and by using an alphabet of which each letter was represented by so many beats. And all this they did more quickly and more accurately than he, Maurice MAETERLINCK, a man and an educated one, was able to do. There was no doubt that they did it. The question was, How did they do it?

There was no doubt that they did it. 'Must we once more repeat, in connection with these startling performances, that those who speak of audible or visible signals, of telepathy and wireless telegraphy, of expedients, trickery or deceit, are speaking of what they do not know and of what they have not seen? There is but one reply to be made to any one who honestly refuses to believe.'

What is that reply? 'Go to Elberfeld—the problem is sufficiently important, sufficiently big with consequences to make the journey worth while—and, behind closed doors, alone with the horse, in the absolute solitude and silence of the stable, set Muhamed to extract half-a-dozen roots which, like that which I have mentioned, require thirty-one operations. You must yourself be ignorant of the solutions, so as to do away with any transmission of unconscious thought. If he then gives you, one after the other, five or six correct solutions, as he did to me and many others, you will not go away with the conviction that the animal is able by its intelligence to extract those roots, because that conviction would upset too thoroughly the greater part of the certainties on which your life is based; but you will at any rate be persuaded that you have been for a few minutes in the presence of one of the greatest and strangest riddles that can disturb the mind of man; and it is always a good and salutary thing to come into contact with emotions of this order.'

Why are we not allowed to believe that the horses can do these things by their intelligence? Apparently because of the effects of such a belief on our conscience. 'The theory of intelligence in the animal would be so extraordinary as to be almost untenable.' That is to say, we should have to remember what it means to believe that horses can understand us, can think, can work out complicated problems, and that they have had this intelligence throughout all the centuries in which they have been the servants of man. For it is not the stallions at Elberfeld only that can do these things. There is evidence enough that of horses as of men, some are stupid and some are clever; but as many horses are clever as you will find among an equal number of men or boys.

Now it is simply incredible to MAETERLINCK that all through the centuries horses should have been possessed of this degree of intelligence. His conscience will not allow him to believe it. For then we should be guilty of having prevented the horse from making progress and attaining to its own independent civilization. His fear also prevents it. For again it would be our duty to give the horse this opportunity in the future, with what results for good or evil it is too awful to prophesy.

MAETERLINCK relieves his conscience and puts his fears to rest in this way. First of all he points out that the handling of numbers is no sure sign of real intelligence. There have been men and boys of very moderate understanding who could do as wonderful things with figures as these horses.

at Elberfeld can do—mathematical prodigies with less than average intelligence in all other ways. And secondly he suggests that their intelligence is not conscious intelligence, but only subconscious or subliminal.

We need not therefore be so ashamed of the past or so afraid of the future. If the intelligence of the horse is merely subconscious, it could not at any time in the past have made progress or risen to any degree of civilization. Nor can it at any time in the future work out an independent culture for good or ill. Progress is possible only to conscious reflexion and co-operation.

The Name of Jesus.

By the Rev. H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in New College, Edinburgh.

'Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins.'—Mt 1^{21}.

In every home the naming of a little child is an event of peculiarly deep interest, wakening memories and prayers and hopes of an unusual kind. It is the first acknowledgment that a new personality has begun to live. But in a pious Jewish household the occurrence was more impressive still, for this reason amongst others, that names bestowed in Bible times were more by a great deal than simply distinguishing labels. The name was meant to tell you something of the person. It stood very frequently either for memorable facts connected with his birth, or for a purpose he should yet fulfil in God's plan. Moses is an example of this; another is John the Baptist, and there are many others. Personal appellations in Scripture are not just so many chance syllables, but rather condensed definitions, or, as it has been put, 'summary descriptions of people by their more prominent characteristics.'

Take that well-known phrase of the Old Testament, caught up by prophet after prophet, 'the name of the Lord.' Any one can see how it signifies very much more than the mere vocal sounds employed in designating Jehovah. The name of God is the equivalent of His revealed character; it is a compendious representation of His manifested nature, and thus, in many places, really synonymous with very God Himself. That comes out clearly in the verses: 'The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it and is safe,' and 'The name of the God of Jacob defend thee.' Obviously something is meant here quite other than an arbitrary collocation of sounds which in itself implies nothing. So far from that, it implies everything that matters. When I know God's name, I know His heart; when I trust His name, I trust His very self. Cross over to the New Testament, and before you have gone far it appears that the same depth of meaning and the same supreme authority and power have begun to cluster round the name of Jesus Christ, so that after the resurrection St. Peter can turn to the crowd, open-eyed and half-incredulous, swarming round the healed cripple, and give them an explanation of the occurrence which startled almost as much as the miracle had done—'His name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong.' And twenty years after, St. Paul concludes a sublime picture of the love of Jesus, and its great sacrificial act, with the words of adoring praise: 'Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him the name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow.'

So let us think of the first bestowal of that name which has long become, by its mere sound, a symbol and epitome of redeeming love. That could be no external label: rather it must always have been an implicit prophecy and characterization, and its meaning and occasion ought to reward our study.

There is, *first*, the name itself—Jesus. Dictionaries will tell you that this, as a proper name, was by no means unusual. It gives many people a kind of shock to find that it belonged to others than our Lord, that it was borne by scores of

Hebrew boys. Even in the New Testament it occurs repeatedly. There was a Jesus amongst Christ's forefathers; in Hebrews, it is the Greek form of Joshua, the famous captain of Israel; by a strange legend, Barabbas is related to have had Jesus as part of his name; there was a Christian Jesus in St. Paul's company as he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians. So, though it is now consecrate for us, filling a place of greatness and reverence by itself, yet it was once as ordinary and familiar as Joseph or Samuel or David, and it must have been fairly frequent in the Nazareth circle in which Christ grew up.

Now in this surface fact of history we may find a deeper truth. Christ chose to be very near us: when He stooped down, and came beside us, it was not to lead a half-human life, outwardly participant in our lot while in reality and in secret transcending and escaping from its conditions. He came to be a Man amongst men, the Elder Brother of us all. Hence, as if to make His nearness unmistakably plain and such as showed all barriers and partitions to be antiquated and swept away for ever by One who shared the joy and grief of men, and all their hopes and prayers and burdens—to mark this from the outset, there was chosen the familiar name of Jesus. No lonely title was reserved for Him, as if He would not tread life's common ways. He asked for nothing better than the rest; for Him the name was enough which had served the generations. It is all of a piece—is it not?—with His great motive and design in being here at all. It is but one aspect more of His willingness as Redeemer of the world to make the lot and destiny of men His own to the extremest limit; that attitude of brotherhood and affinity which the New Testament points to in the words, 'Forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same.'

There are periods of time we have all known when it is difficult to be proud, or even passably hopeful, regarding this life and world of ours. A glimpse is now and then vouchsafed us of the dark swollen stream of ignorance, crime, uncleanness and cruelty that flows through the land, occasionally washing up very close to our own doorstep; until the feeling sweeps over the mind that while nothing is easier than to pour out platitudes about the greatness of man or the incredible triumphs of civilization, yet the loudness of our pæans, like their extravagance, is often in directly inverse ratio to our real knowledge. 'I know no study,' Huxley has written, 'which is so unutterably saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history.' And even if we protest, not without a natural vehemence, against the reasonableness or finality of a view so melancholy, still, if we are serious at all, it is impossible to forget how much the New Testament itself has to say respecting the sins and sorrows of this mixed world. When we face facts, we know there is too much bloodshed, wickedness and misery, too much greed and pride and lust, for men who love truth to fold their hands in comfort and repeat the smooth counsel that all is well. Yes! and it is precisely when we have seen these dark things close at hand, and felt the horror of them, as well as their fatal touch on our own hearts, that we go back all the more eagerly to the inexhaustible springs of hope and faith unsealed by the advent of the Son of God. If Christ was man, if He was not ashamed to call us brethren, the prospect is not all darkness; rather in the Father's mind and will for mankind there must be great sweeping purposes of victory and blessing. If Christ was man, then it is good to be a man, and to have a man's place and opportunity. If Christ was man, there are seeds of greatness in our being which He means shall grow to fruitage, and by the thought of them pessimism is once for all obliterated, because of the sure promise they contain that our dreams for the world are coming true. This Jesus, who bent so low, we by faith see 'crowned with glory and honour'; and through Him and along with Him those also whom He has ransomed with His blood.

Jesus is the name exalted
Over every other name,
In this name, whene'er assaulted,
We can put our foes to shame.

Note, *secondly*, that the coming of Jesus is prepared for. On high themes of this nature we can use none but faint and imperfect human terms; and yet in these terms, imperfect as they are, it is impossible to do less than describe the coming of Jesus Christ as a stupendous fact in the life of God Himself. No scruples derived from the thought of the Divine immutability can forbid our saying this. His birth meant everything for us, the receivers; for God the giver it meant yet more. All His revelation of a love that seeks and wins

the sinful; all His prophecies; all His acts and purposes,—upon these there was now laid the last and crowning gift. It had always been intended that Jesus should visit us, and at length His voice was heard, 'Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.'

All that did not happen by accident, or unforeseen. When He appeared, to live beside us the human life of God, His place in the world had been made ready by the Father. A name had been prepared; a people also, in whose experience the truth and meaning of the name should be verified. It was when all things were ready—Divine mercy in its wideness, human weakness in its utter need—that God sent forth His Son.

See the truth that is here for each one of us. No life on earth begins unprepared for. The Father's love is in advance of our coming; He goes before us, knowing the way we shall take, its dangers, its necessities, its mysterious potencies of good and evil. Is it not the fact that God made our place ready before He called us, as George Macdonald puts it, 'out of the everywhere into here'? I think you can tell some of His preparations; you can mark them down on the list of blessings. There is the boon, for example, of a God-fearing ancestry. A wise Scottish missionary was once heard to say that 'to make a sound Christian of a Hindoo you must convert his grandmother'; and the truth of the remark is as plain as its humour. To give men the best chance of Christian manhood, the work must begin generations earlier. The strength and massiveness of the tree is fixed not merely by the soil, but by the stock it springs from; and in something of the same way, as one Psalmist declares, God prevents us with the blessings of goodness—He lays His plan long years ahead, so that when at the appointed hour we find ourselves wakening in the world it is as surrounded and enfolded, not from any foresight of our own, with love and pureness and prayer. Wealth of the best kind has been laid up for us; when we are born, it is to a great heritage. To fall heir to a home in which God is reverenced, and Christ obeyed, and righteousness believed in, and truth spoken, and tenderness diffused, and womanhood held in honour—surely in all this God has taken measures from of old that we should be born rich apart from all our labour or deserving. How much His great love makes over to us at that very hour when we step into the world!

No doubt exceptions may be found, or what seem to be exceptions, to this happy rule. There are children, I know, who appear to be born to coarseness and wrong-doing as others to purity and virtue; yet who shall say that even round about their empty lot the Father's mercies are not strewn? Every hour they have temptations, where we have only brightness and sweet inspirations; from the beginning they are as if set upon an inclined plane hurling them ever downward with increasing impetus until the last dreadful plunge into death and ruin. Yet shall we say that this is all, or that their dark path is quite lonely or defenceless? It is not so. The same love that chose a name for Jesus stands by the cot of each little life, with hands full of promises and gifts; and even above their weakness we have faith to speak the ancient word: 'Is he not thy Father that hath bought thee?'

But that is a digression, even if not, I hope, altogether irrelevant. Still, leaving it, I would ask you to observe how it is the Divine provision for all Jesus' future which imparts to this verse its amazing note of certainty. Not a loud or obtrusive note; yet all the more impressive for that reason. If familiarity had not dulled our sense, we could not miss the strange and improbable nature of the situation—an obscure Galilean peasant child, in social conditions utterly dissimilar to ours, and yet over His fragility and insignificance are spoken words by which hearts in every age have been set a-throbbing: 'This is Jesus; he shall save his people from their sins.' There could be no more piercing contrast between fact and prophecy, between the visible frailty and the majesty foretold, between what is and what is to be. And yet we look in vain for a sign of misgiving or reserve. It is all as sure as if it had already happened. 'He shall save his people.' And is not that the note which runs through the New Testament in every page? Is it not the tone repeated unfailingly in every form of Christianity worthy of the name? Not conjectures, or hypotheses, or peradventures; not feverish hope subsiding into chill despair; but just this clear and quiet assurance. What is of man takes and must take the chances of time, and may be lost in shipwreck; what is of God moves on in triumph to the end.

Have you caught the infection of that faith? Do you know in whom you have believed? When you think about the Kingdom of God, or speak of

it to others, is there in your words and look anything of this unwavering confidence? Or do you stand off coolly, ready to estimate the chance of Christ's failing in His task, or succeeding, as dispassionately as you might the result of some general election? If you bear His name, you know without my saying which temper most befits you. Long ere Jesus entered on His work, its victory had been all foretold; and it would be strange indeed if in view of His triumphs throughout the past, and in our own lives, we had grown content with any lesser hope. Let us seek a better knowledge of Him as clothed with that power in which He fulfilled the Father's perfect purpose on our behalf, and all our faint expectations will be dilated to the sovereign measure of His greatness.

Think, *lastly*, of the interpretation of the name —'He shall save his people from their sins.'

Here is the earliest promise in the New Testament. It tells that Jesus is the Saviour: not a Teacher only, or a hero, or a genius, or one more pious good man; but the Saviour in the last and highest sense. He saves all who trust Him, too, from their sins—not from mere punishment, or from unpleasant consequences, or from anything at all except sin itself. Further, He is depicted as saving them from sins that are *theirs*—from the load and curse of particular wrong things they have done, not in the least from sin as a far-off abstraction, which we can contemplate or analyze without giving it any special relation to ourselves. Jesus has done nothing to us at all commensurate with His aim unless He has become to us a Saviour, redeeming us from that which we have been. All that is in the text, for you and me.

Now the salvation we owe to Jesus can be described from a variety of points of view.[1] Many times in the Gospels salvation means simply restored conditions and repaired functions: as when we read concerning the sick people brought close to our Lord, that 'as many as touched him were *saved*.' That, however, though certainly a real part of salvation, was not the whole of it; and therefore a word that had started from more exterior meanings, such as material safety and preservation, came to possess significations of a kind constantly newer and higher and more wonderful. Men who began by craving deliverance from foes and the various mischances of life came to God at last for redemption from their own worse self and from the terrible power of evil habit. Not only so, but a word so rich and deep really could not be confined in its tenses. It covers all the past—yes, but also the present, as when St. Paul declares that Jesus 'gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us—that is, save us—from this present evil world.' And finally it widens its outlook and takes in the entire future, for He 'is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him.' A Saviour 'to the uttermost,' it has been said, is a Saviour who saves right up to the end.

But these meanings of salvation—and they are so wide and numerous, no catalogue could be exhaustive—all find their true centre in the text. When you get down to bed-rock, salvation is a word that points to sin. Believe me, there is no salvation anywhere which does not hinge on a right relation to God, and a right inward state consequent on that; and it is this that Jesus gives to the longing soul. He delivers from sin in every form —from its penalty no doubt, but also from its practice; from its guilt, its stain, its tyranny, its awful power to shut us out from fellowship with God. To all who are His people—and that includes everybody who has turned to Him in choice and longing—He gives deliverance of this kind. Part of the salvation is finished, and you can have it now. He did that on your behalf, when He tasted death, which authorizes a message telling of reconciliation full and free. You have only to put out a hand and lay hold, and the salvation is such that it will lift you up to the elevation and the blessedness of the children of God.

And then part of the salvation is yet to come. There is much to happen before we are entirely and thoroughly delivered, and it can be said of us as of the multitude in the seer's vision, 'They are without spot before the throne of God.' But whether present boon or future heritage, everything that can be called salvation is the gift of Jesus; and till that lesson has been learnt we are still at cross-purposes with the love of God.

Very much passes for religious literature to-day, I think it may be said, in which epithets of praise and admiration are so heaped upon Jesus Christ that He is all but complimented out of His place as the world's Redeemer. And other nobler hearts there are, who, venturing a little nearer, toil after Him bravely as their example. But these are only fragments of the truth. As fragments doubtless

[1] See Prof. Rendel Harris' *Aaron's Breastplate*, p. 85 ff.

they possess fragmentary power to save, for the curative powers of a medicine dwell in its slightest particle; nevertheless, if we are not to miss the best things of all, we must find in Jesus Christ more than our hero, or our pattern—namely, the Lord and Healer who saves men by His cross. Do not drain away the life-blood even of the lower truths, by separating them from the better and richer whole. See them, and then possess them in the unity of salvation as Christ imparts it. You and I need the same great Christ that men have needed always, and I entreat you to take Him for your Christ, in all His power, believing that He will make you His people, saved from your sins.

Literature.

THE PAPYRI.

Professor James Hope Moulton and Professor George Milligan have now issued the First Part of their much expected work on the papyri. The title is *The Vocabulary of the New Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary Sources* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The 'get-up' is similar to Hatch and Redpath's *Septuagint Concordance*, and the printing is most beautiful; and as this Part contains a hundred pages of double column, the price is amazingly small.

Much of the material has already appeared in the *Expositor*, but let no reader of the *Expositor* think that he is independent of this work. Every week brings new material, as was shown by Professor Moulton's note in last month's Expository Times. And every day's further study suggests new illustrations or modifies old ones.

We should like to quote some of the more striking illustrations of the New Testament vocabulary given in these fascinating columns, but it would be neither generous nor wise. Perhaps one small matter may be referred to. In 2 P 3^{10} we read that 'the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up.' That is good sense, if not very refreshing. But unfortunately the word rendered 'burned up' has very little authority. The only word that *has* authority means nothing but 'shall be found,' which is original enough but rather poor sense. Henry Bradshaw suggested that a word had dropped out, the word *arga*. It had dropped out because of its likeness to *erga* ('works') standing beside it. Then the meaning would be 'the earth and the works that are therein shall be found barren.' Now the editors have come upon a pretty word-play between *erga* and *arga* which recalls Henry Bradshaw's emendation and gives them courage to speak of it as 'brilliant and convincing.'

We congratulate the Editors. In this case well begun is more than half done. The accuracy of the work is possible only to scholars of the first order.

DONALD JOHN MARTIN.

The Rev. Norman C. Macfarlane has written the biography of his friend the *Rev. Donald John Martin* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net). The Rev. Donald John Martin was a minister of the United Free Church of Scotland. Now, many are the ministers of that Church and of other Churches whose lives are worth recording, but the world would not contain the books that should be written. What has this minister done to deserve it?

The title-page says that he was a Preacher, a Soul Winner, and a Social Reformer. But it was not any of these nor all of them together that entitled him to a biography. It was the man himself. He would have been himself and deserving of a biography if he had been anything else than a preacher, soul winner, or social reformer. He would have had an influence for good on his day and generation which it would have been the clear duty of some one to record for the good of the generations to come. For he was truly a great man. He was great in his love for some men, in his toleration for all men, in the heights he reached (especially in the presence of God and of nature), and in the depths to which he descended, depths of gloom and misery (in the presence of the evil that is still in the world).

To his love of nature a whole chapter is devoted. But he loved God first. The story of his conversion

is told with all the circumstances that make it to be seen and read of men in its reality and wholeheartedness. And so, when nature appealed to him, it was God's world that appealed, and it always called him into God's presence. 'It seems to me,' he said, 'that it takes a Christian really to enjoy Nature.' One beautiful winter day he was golfing at Taynuilt with his friend the United Free Church minister there. He stopped in the middle of the course, and lifted up his eyes to the vision of the snow-clad Ben Cruachan range. 'Oh, Munro,' he said, 'let us pray.' Down went clubs. He lifted his voice with 'Lord bless this beautiful district.'

The author of the biography tells us in one place that Martin was not a great preacher, and in another that he was not a great pastor. Where did his influence come from then? It seems to have come from his prayerfulness. Who could resist the power of a man of great physical strength and great mental breadth who seemed made to do by his own ability everything that he had to do, and who nevertheless carried everything to the Throne of Grace? He paid a visit to Australia, and on the way entertained his fellow-passengers with delightful anecdotes and boisterous laughter, but when he was invited to take part in a fancy dress ball, he said, 'I do not know what to do. I would like to please the captain. I should also like to do what would please my dear Lord Jesus, and I shall ask Him to tell me. I am sure He will, for He always leads us rightly if we are willing to do what is right.'

Yes, he told stories. Let us end this inadequate notice of a charmingly written book by quoting two. 'Speaking in the General Assembly, on the Highland night, he amused the house by a story told of Dr. Kennedy of Dingwall. When Mr. Spurgeon was in Dingwall, opening Dr. Kennedy's new church, both of them went out for a walk. A friend came along, and Dr. Kennedy stood to speak to him. The conversation was in Gaelic. When they moved on, Mr. Spurgeon said, "What language was that you spoke?" "Did you not know? That was the language Adam and Eve spoke in the garden of Eden." Spurgeon said, "I don't wonder they were turned out."

'Some of Martin's people, like Scotchmen everywhere, preferred the purely doctrinal sermons. *They* did not sting. He often told a story which he heard Dr. Moody Stuart tell to a gathering of students at New College. It was of a stern lady who was provokingly evangelical. There came to the pulpit one Sabbath a minister whose soundness she doubted. When he gave as his text, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God," the lady turned to her next neighbour, and said, "Weel, weel, if there's ony text in a' the Book waur than anither yon man is sure to tak' it."'

THE APOCRYPHA.

Two signs that men are turning their thoughts to the Apocrypha are noted by Dr. Oesterley. One is the founding of the 'International Society for the Promoting of the Study of the Apocrypha,' with the publication of its quarterly journal, *The International Journal of Apocrypha*, ably edited by the Rev. Herbert Pentin. The other is the issue last year by the Oxford University Press of the two sumptuous volumes entitled *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, with introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books, edited, in conjunction with many scholars, by Dr. R. H. Charles. We may note a third sign. It is the issue of a handsome volume by Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley himself, entitled *The Books of the Apocrypha, their Origin, Teaching, and Contents* (Scott; 16s. net).

It is a large book. It might have been published in two volumes, had not two-volume books got out of favour lately. It is clearly divided into two parts, the first part being general introduction to the whole of the Apocrypha, and the second special introduction to each of its books. To our thinking, the first part, which is also the longest, running to 315 pages, is most useful at the present time. But the work on the separate books is done just as carefully and with as thorough a grasp of the problems and the literature. Every item of knowledge offered is absolutely up to date, even Dr. Charles's volumes being passed in a few particulars.

The first part, we have said, is a general introduction to the Apocrypha. What that means will be understood when we name the titles of its chapters. They are: (1) The Hellenistic Movement; (2) Hellenistic Influence upon the Jews of Palestine; (3) Hellenistic Influence upon the Jews of the Dispersion; (4) Traces of Greek Influence in the Old Testament and in the

Apocrypha; (5) The Apocalyptic Movement; (6) The Scribes; (7) The Pharisees and Sadducees; (8) The Origin of the Old Testament Canon; (9) Uncanonical Books; (10) The Apocalyptic Literature; (11) The Wisdom Literature; (12) The Doctrinal Teaching of the Apocrypha.

Perhaps the newest and freshest work is found in the chapter on the Pharisees and Sadducees. Dr. Oesterley is aware of all the ferment that has been going on about the gospel presentation of the Pharisees, but he has not lost his head over it. His account of their position and belief is eminently sane and satisfactory. Here as elsewhere the writing is refreshingly lucid and finished. To most readers, however, it is the last chapter that will make the chief appeal—the chapter on the Doctrinal Teaching of the Apocrypha. Its topics are—The Doctrine of God, of the Law, of Sin, of Grace and Free-will, of the Messiah, of the Future Life, of Angels, and of Demons.

The book is completed with an admirable series of indexes—General Index of Subjects and Names, Passages from the Old Testament, Passages from the Apocrypha, Passages from the Pseudepigrapha, Passages from the New Testament, Passages from Rabbinical Literature.

SHAKESPEARE'S ENVIRONMENT.

Mrs. C. C. Stopes knows so well all that has been done to find out the influences that made Shakespeare what he was that we can depend upon whatever she writes that it will do more than repeat what we already know. Some of the things contained in the papers which she gathers into a book with the title *Shakespeare's Environment* (Bell; 7s. 6d. net) are no longer new, it is true, but they were new when the papers were written, and we owe the knowledge of them to herself. Other things are wholly new and worth knowing, for few Shakespeare scholars can remember all they read, and fewer can have access to all the articles which Mrs. Stopes has written.

There is a certain, not too evident but yet existent, unity in the book, though the papers it contains were written at different times and addressed to various audiences. That unity is due to the author's determination to state all that can be known now of the men and books which had their influence on the framing of Shakespeare's mind, and then all that can be known of the influence which his mind had on those who wrote after him. Not one of the essays, therefore, should be neglected by the student, however multifarious their topics be, and their topics are multifarious — 'Shakespeare's Aunts,' 'Shakespeare and Asbies,' 'Mary Arden's Arms,' 'Stratford's "Bookless Neighbourhood,"' '"Honorificabilitudinitatibus" in Warwickshire,' 'Sixteenth Century Locks and Weirs on the Thames,' 'Sixteenth Century Women Students,' and many more.

The best service that Mrs. Stopes has rendered to the great cause is perhaps in the information which she has gathered and made public about Shakespeare's personal friends. For she is right in saying that 'the surest way to learn more of Shakespeare is to learn more about his friends.'

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

The Rev. Henry J. Wicks, B.A., presented 'The Doctrine of God in the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature,' as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Divinity in the University of London. The examiner was Canon Charles, who not only recommended it for the degree, but was so favourably impressed with it that he advised that the thesis should be published, since it formed a good contribution to the subject he had chosen, 'and one which I should like to possess in a permanent form.' The publication has been carried out. *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* is before us in a large octavo volume (Hunter & Longhurst; 10s. net).

On such a subject Canon Charles must be allowed the last word. When he approves, no one will condemn. It is enough to say that the Introduction contains the best short account of the literature to be dealt with that we have seen, so clear is it, so restrained, and so deftly are the numerous knotty problems in it either unravelled or left alone.

The Introduction fills twenty-six pages. Then the book is divided into three parts. One part deals with the Transcendence of God, one with the Justice of God, and one with the Grace of God. In each case the subject is handled chronologically, and in three periods—the second century B.C., the first century B.C., the first century A.D. Finally, under each part and each century, each book is examined separately. That is the method.

No method is likely to be more satisfactory; certainly none could be more intelligible or accessible.

BERNADOTTE.

By choosing for his title *Bernadotte, the First Phase* (Murray; 15s. net), Mr. D. Plunket Barton may not have intended to challenge comparison with Lord Rosebery's *Napoleon, the Last Phase*, but he has suggested it. And he does not suffer from a comparison. Vivid as Lord Rosebery's narrative is, Mr. Barton's is not less vivid. He has been as painstaking in investigation. And, above all, he has that indescribable but essential thing for an historian, distinction: beyond all the facts and their setting-forth there is from the beginning of the book to the end of it that something which wraps itself round the reader and holds him a willing captive. In short, Mr. Barton's *Bernadotte* is one of the few really great books written in English on the Napoleonic circle, and will live. The author has had the advantage of an open field to work in; it is a wonderful thing that the early career of Bernadotte has had so little attention given to it. But success would have come to him with his gifts, however well-worked his field had been.

Bernadotte—'a lawyer's son, a youth of seventeen years of age, ran away in 1780 from his home at Pau, and enlisted in a marching regiment. He served for more than ten years in the ranks of the army of King Louis XVI.; rose, after the outbreak of the Revolution, to the rank of general; held, under the Directory, the posts of general-in-chief, ambassador, and Minister of War; became a Marshal and a Prince of the First Empire; and, after taking part in nearly all the great events of one of the most eventful epochs in the world's history, was, in 1810, elected Crown Prince of the Kingdom of Sweden. Having added the crown of Norway to that of Sweden, he remained the real ruler of Scandinavia until his death in 1844; and left behind him, in his adopted country, a good name, and a dynasty which has taken root.'

The book is in parts, each part being made up of short chapters, each chapter filled with incident. The reader is simply not allowed to rest. The usually misplaced and weak comparison, 'like a novel,' is in its place here and accurate. There is the hero, and he *is* a hero in the hands of this sympathetic writer, though his faults are not forgotten; there is the villain, though Napoleon is never blackened to serve that end; there is the hourly occurring incident; and there is the imposing conclusion.

'It may have been on the arrival of the regiment at Marseilles in September 1789 that the incident occurred, which, to the end of her life, Queen Desirée of Sweden was fond of relating. She was the daughter of M. François Clary, a rich and prominent merchant of Irish descent, resident in Marseilles. Her chamberlain has related the story in her own words: "One day a soldier presented himself with a requisition billeting him in our house at Marseilles. My father, who had no wish to be disturbed by the noise which soldiers usually make, politely sent him back with a letter to his colonel, requesting that an officer might be billeted on us instead of a soldier. The soldier who was sent back in this way was Bernadotte, who was afterwards to marry me and become a king."'

That is one of the incidents.

LORD STRATHCONA.

The Life and Times of Lord Strathcona (Eveleigh Nash; 7s. 6d. net) have been described by Mr. W. T. R. Preston, a lifelong political opponent with a rather bitter spirit and persistent memory. Lord Strathcona is described as selfish, politically and personally, reticent or courteous or savage to suit his ends, and narrowly escaping, if he does escape, the most hateful of all opprobriums, that of the Pharisee. Fortunately one can *see* that the portrait is not quite true; one can even see that it is distorted beyond all semblance of the truth. There is no denying the readableness of the book, for Mr. Preston can write as well as hate. But the most readable part of it is the one part that is agreeable—the sketch of Lady Strathcona. For Lady Strathcona, Mr. Preston has only admiration. This is what he says:

'Those who were favoured with Lady Strathcona's friendship and confidence came to know a candid and kindly nature. Her perfect frankness was her charm. In the old days in Labrador, when the Indians would gather at the post apparently determined to make a *quasi* permanent stay, diplomatic suggestions from the head of the house that it was time to go had no effect whatever.

She, however, took a hand in the dismissal, treating them like the children of Nature that they were, and, as the writer heard her tell her story of her experiences in this particular, she said: "They moved quickly for me, when they would not budge for Donald A."

'In London Lady Strathcona was so overshadowed by the official and personal prominence of her husband, that many who only casually knew her as the social head of the Canadian circle failed to appreciate her diffident and unassuming womanliness. Honesty and candour were ever present in her intercourse with people, but never unkindness. Entering, as Lady Strathcona did, the highest social circles of the Empire when the shadows of life had long lengthened, she never lost herself—there always remained a sweet personality. Those who were admitted to that intimacy will always have the pleasantest recollections of her charm, her gentle kindness, and her sympathy.

'If sometimes she wished for more of the quietness of family life, and less incessant social demands—the part of life in which Lord Strathcona revelled, it is not a matter of surprise.

'During Lord Strathcona's lease of Knebworth, nothing gave him greater pleasure than to invite friends there for the week-end. Upon one occasion he left word at Grosvenor Square, when he was leaving for the day, that he had invited Sir Charles and Lady Tupper to go to Knebworth with them, and that Sir Charles was to send a message whether he could go or not. Just at the moment that the telephone rang, Lady Strathcona happened to be in the hall. The butler, receiving a message, turned to Lady Strathcona, saying, "It is Sir Charles Tupper, your Ladyship. He says that he and Lady Tupper will be glad to go to Knebworth this afternoon." "Oh, bother the Tuppers," said Lady Strathcona, "I don't want them at Knebworth this week." The butler, knowing Lord Strathcona's wishes, did just what any well-trained butler would have done under the circumstances, and replied to Sir Charles with studied decorum, "Lady Strathcona is delighted to hear you are going, and will meet you at King's Cross Station at three o'clock." The last shot from Lady Strathcona before the 'phone was hung up was, "You have no right to say that."

'However Sir Charles and Lady Tupper were at the station in time to meet the other guests and take the train for Knebworth. Sir Charles was very quiet. He was far from forgetting what he had heard at the other end of the 'phone, and wondered how he could even up with the little woman with the candid tongue.

'During dinner Sir Charles turned the conversation to the general convenience of the modern telephone. He was sitting a little distance from Lady Strathcona. Suddenly addressing her he said, "But you know, Lady Strathcona, telephones are very dangerous things to have around sometimes." "Are they indeed, Sir Charles? Do tell me how, because I am very near ours quite often." The company was all attention as Sir Charles leaned over, and with a kindly smile said, "Yes, very dangerous, Lady Strathcona, because I heard every word you said to-day when I 'phoned to Grosvenor Square." Quick as a flash the reply came, "Well, Sir Charles, I meant every word of it." Of course the company insisted upon hearing the story, which was told by Lady Strathcona amid roars of laughter, in which Sir Charles joined most heartily. In conversation after the ladies had retired from the dining-room, Sir Charles said good-humouredly, "Lady Strathcona is too sharp for me, but I do enjoy her candour."'

BOOKS ON THE BIBLE.

Messrs. Revell have reissued Henry Ward Beecher's *Bible Studies in the Old Testament* (2s. 6d. net).

The second volume has been published of *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, in Mr. Buckland's 'Devotional Commentary' (2s.). The editor of St. Mark in this series is the Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D.

Messrs. Washbourne have published a new edition of the Douay Version of *The Holy Bible* (3s. 6d.). In addition to a preface by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the edition contains Bishop Challoner's notes, newly compiled indexes, tables, and verified references. Room has been found also for Pope Leo XIII.'s 'Encyclical on the Study of the Holy Scriptures,' and a new series of maps.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have reissued Cunningham Geikie's *Hours with the Bible*, in ten volumes (3s. 6d. net each). This was the original

title. In 1893, Dr. Geikie published 'an entirely new edition, largely re-written,' and changed the name into *The Bible by Modern Light*. The present publishers have not only reissued that edition, but added to it the volumes on the New Testament which were subsequently published by Dr. Geikie. So that now we have the whole series in one attractive style of binding, and under the first, and by far the best, title.

At last, after long waiting, after we had almost given up hope of it, the commentary on *The Book of Leviticus* in the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges' has appeared (Cambridge: At the University Press; 3s. net). Only one commentary has yet to come, that on Deuteronomy. Then this series, begun under the editorship of Bishop Perowne ever so long ago, will be complete. It is without doubt the most popular of all the elementary commentaries on the Bible, and it deserves its popularity.

The commentary on Leviticus has been done by A. T. Chapman, M.A., and A. W. Streane, D.D. Mr. Chapman died in December 1913, after writing the notes to the end of the sixteenth chapter; Dr. Streane has completed the work. It would have been impossible at one time for Dr. Streane to finish what Mr. Chapman had begun; but after long study he abandoned the traditional attitude to the Old Testament and accepted a position not greatly differing from that of Driver. That was Mr. Chapman's position also. And so far as we can see, this commentary might have been written by one hand. It is short; but when a point of importance emerges it receives sufficient attention, if not in the notes, then in the introduction or the appendix. The poverty of commentaries on Leviticus makes it precious; but it is to be greatly valued for its own sake also.

Two new volumes of the 'Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges' have also appeared. They are *The First Epistle General of Peter*, edited by the Rev. G. W. Blenkin, M.A. (3s. 6d. net), and *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Ephesians*, edited by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D. (3s. 6d. net). The volume on First Peter is particularly welcome, because its companion on the English Version, written by Professor Plumptre, was written so long ago as 1880, and a vast deal of work has been done on the General Epistles since then. The English commentary on Ephesians is not so ancient, but its editor, Bishop Moule, has his own idea of commenting, an idea which differs widely from that of Dr. Murray. In both these new commentaries the introduction is of great length and as valuable as it is long. In Dr. Murray's book there is quite an essay on the phrase 'in Christ.' To give a young student a grasp of that phrase is to introduce him to Christ, so far as that can be done intellectually.

It is becoming difficult to keep distinct in one's mind the various commentaries on the books of the Bible issued at the Cambridge University Press. Of *St. Mark*, for example, there is Dr. Maclear's edition in the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges' using the Authorized Version; and there is the smaller edition of Sir A. F. Hort and Mrs. Chitty, using the Revised Version. Then there are the 'Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges' in which St. Mark is again edited by Dr. Maclear, and Sir A. F. Hort's edition with introduction and notes for beginners. Now there has been published a new edition of the Greek text with maps, notes, and introduction by Dr. Alfred Plummer, which is no doubt meant to supersede Maclear's book (4s. 6d. net).

It is an example of Dr. Plummer's finest work—if one can speak comparatively of work that is always as fine as scholarship, care, and ability can make it. Into every note, even the shortest, learning is packed, and the learning is always lit up with life.

Whatever Mr. William Canton does he endeavours to do better than it has been done before. You may suppose that when he undertook to write the history of the Bible in English he had no thought of repeating other men's words. Often as the story has been told, this volume, called *The Bible and the Anglo-Saxon People* (Dent; 5s. net), has the freshness of untrodden paths. It is not merely and not mainly that discoveries are made; it is that the writer puts himself into the book, puts his own captivating personality into it, and links the whole long history together by unfailing charm of style, unfaltering human hopefulness and love. There are few subjects that arrest the attention of a Bible Class more easily than this. There is no book that will furnish forth the teacher more easily. It is a publisher's as well as an author's success.

There is still something to be said on the Beatitudes. The Rev. T. Arthur Bailey, B.A., proves it. His *Messages of the Beatitudes* (Scott; 2s. net) must be read though twenty books on the Beatitudes have been read before it. 'Blessed are they that mourn.' We must interpret 'mourn' as 'sorrow deeply.' And this sorrow is of two kinds. It is the product of conviction of sin, or it is the sorrow of passion for others. And then Mr. Bailey says this: 'Blessed are they that mourn for the sorrows of others: for they shall be comforted—comforted in their own sorrows.'

The readers of the *Record* have without doubt been readers of Dr. Eugene Stock's papers therein on the Pastoral Epistles, and it is the same readers who will be most ready to welcome these papers in their handy and handsome book form. The volume is published by Mr. Robert Scott under the title of *Plain Talks on the Pastoral Epistles* (5s. net). 'Plain Talks' is just the right name to give them. And being what they profess to be, they will be more read, and have more influence, than if they formed a systematic word-for-word commentary on these Epistles. One advantage is that we can dip into them at any place and find something. On page 43, for example, we find this: In both the Epistles to Timothy, St. Paul speaks of being a preacher and a teacher. These two words are discussed, examples of their use being given and explained: and then two practical lessons are found—one to the teacher never to preach, the other to the preacher never to forget to teach.

The *Side-Lights on the Epistle to the Philippians* which have been compiled by the Rev. Charles G. Baskerville, M.A., Hon. Canon of Rochester, are published apparently as hints for the preacher (Nisbet; 1s. 6d. net). More suitable for evangelistic addresses perhaps than for the stated sermon, they are packed with points all directed to the commendation of the Cross.

There is no series of commentaries in existence better fitted to furnish the senior student of the Bible with the knowledge he needs than Murby's Larger Scripture Manuals; and there is no series better adapted to the mind of the junior pupil than the same publisher's Smaller Scripture Manuals. Both series are prepared with their particular readers definitely in view. The book of *The Acts of the Apostles* is divided into two parts, of which the first part in each series is issued (2s. 6d. and 1s.). The editor is the Rev. Charles Knapp, D.D., Junior Chaplain of Merton College, Oxford.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

Who could have believed that we should ever have another *Ecce Homo*? Yet it has been written. It has been written by Frederick Lincoln Anderson, D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Newton Theological Institution. We say at once that the new has not the literary fascination of the old. But it has all the rest, and it is adapted to the mind of this present generation. It has all the rest and a little more. For Dr. Anderson is a better student of the New Testament than Seeley was. He is as independent and as reverent; he is as desirous of entering into the mind of Jesus and seeing Him as He saw Himself; he is as entirely occupied with the wish to make Him known to the ordinary men and women of his day.

The title of the book is *The Man of Nazareth* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net).

The first object of the book which has the title of *The Character Christ, Fact or Fiction* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net) is to answer Drews and his friends and prove that Christ Jesus is historical. The answer is made by showing what Christ is in the Gospel portrait. He is a man of Universality, of Masterliness, of Authority, of Love, of Severity, of Forgiveness, of Serenity, of Consistency, of Harmony, and of Finality. If He never existed, who drew His portrait? The painter is always greater than the picture he paints. It is an argument which takes nothing for granted, and it leads to the conclusion — what conclusion? — nothing short of Thomas's 'My Lord and my God.'

And so this is the further object of the book: to describe Jesus in such a way that we may believe that He is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we may have life in His name. The author is William Jefferson Lhamon.

In *The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net), Dr. Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary, brings some of the most outstanding social difficulties of our day into the light of the Gospel—that is to say, the life and

teaching of Christ. The problems are Justice, Woman, Children, Slums, Vice, Crime, Disease, Poverty, and Lawlessness.

Now almost any living man could write a book on these social problems, if he could write at all. For they are in everybody's mouth. And so it has come to pass that we have books by the hundred —witness Professor Vedder's bibliography—without seeing one of the problems advanced a single step. But it must be said of Dr. Vedder that he is nothing if not practical. Of literary style he has his share, but disregards it. He goes straight to the slum and sets his shoulder to the clearing of it. He has found that the slum owes its existence to bad housing. He asks who is to blame for that. He points his finger at the landlord, of course—that is inevitable. But he points it next at the tenant. For the worst cases of all are cases of subletting. And then he points it at you and me. It is curious that he does not name drink. Are there slums without drink in America? We think we could get rid of them here if we could get rid of that.

Washington Gladden's books are sure of a welcome in this country. His latest volume is full of short ethical and very practical essays, after the favourite manner at present in America. The essays were first spoken addresses. They were addressed to mixed audiences, but their objective, we should think, was the young man or young woman present. In any case it is young men and women that he advises to *Live and Learn* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). He advises them in a succession of chapters to live and learn to think, to speak, to see, to hear, to give, to serve, to win, and to wait.

Just as Dr. W. M. Macgregor was delivering his Baird Lecture in which he pleaded for the recognition of the individual's direct approach to God through Christ, Canon W. H. Carnegie, Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster, was writing his book on *Democracy and Christian Doctrine* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net), in which he argues as earnestly for the priority and authority of the Church, and recognises no approach to God that is not made consciously by a member of Christ's Body. After writing his book, Canon Carnegie turned to write a Preface to it. Meantime the War had begun. He wrote his preface to show that all kinds of Christian individualism had failed, and that the kind called Lutheranism was chiefly responsible for the War. His Preface has a project in it also. It is that new relations should be begun at once, to be established as speedily as possible, between the Anglican and the Orthodox Church. They have deep affinities—this above all, that in both the individual is less than the Church, in theory wholly subordinate. So it is a book for the day, and for the grave consideration of Anglicans in particular.

The Rev. John Neville Figgis, Litt.D., D.D., is one of the keenest apologists of our day. He knows what 'apology' has to be in our day, and having defined it aright, he does nothing but apologize. He writes nothing that is not intended to commend Christ and the Gospel to the unbeliever. And the unbeliever may reply, but he cannot ignore.

The new book goes to the very heart of things, which is a way that Dr. Figgis has. It is called *The Fellowship of the Mystery* (Longmans; 5s. net). Originally delivered as the Bishop Paddock Lectures in New York, its chapters have all the ease of good lecturing, but we can see that there is no easy thinking in them. We agree or disagree—we often disagree—but we are compelled to think. At many points Dr. Figgis and Canon Carnegie touch. They both handle questions of authority; they both demand recognition of the Community; they both call the Community a Democracy. Canon Carnegie is more practical, Dr. Figgis is more historical. In the end there is a paper on 'John Henry Newman' and another on 'Modernism *versus* Modernity.' Both are in keeping with the contents of the lectures.

It is at such a time as this that men ask seriously and even anxiously, What is the value of Christ? It is not enough to answer that Christianity and not Christ is at fault. The anti-Christian never lets us off with that. And even in our own consciousness we feel that that is not sufficient. Well, it is just at this time and with a full sense of the responsibility of his words, that Sir W. Robertson Nicoll comes to us and tells us that Christ *is* making a difference. And he tells us what the difference is. His little book with the title *The Difference Christ is Making* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net) is easily read, but we must not be content with one reading.

The Sweet Miracle of Eça de Queiroz has been done into English by Edgar Prestage of the Lisbon Academy of Sciences (Blackwell; 1s. net). It is a story of the time of our Lord on earth. The story is nothing; the Eastern colouring and the charm of style are everything.

One of the most helpful and certainly one of the most interesting of the pamphlets issued by the Student Christian Movement is *Students and the Regeneration of Society*, by Malcolm Spencer, M.A. (6d. net).

The new issues of the 'Modern Oxford Tracts' are: *The Authority of the Church*, by Darwell Stone, D.D.; *Christian Morals*, by R. L. Ottley, D.D.; *God*, by Gilbert C. Joyce, D.D.; and *The Holy Trinity*, by G. H. S. Walpole, D.D. (Longmans; 6d. net each).

A popular and Protestant history of the Society of Jesus has been written by Mr. Hector Macpherson and published under the title of *The Jesuits in History* (Macniven & Wallace). The book is written with a fine command of picturesque English, with ample knowledge, and with no sentimental toleration for the Order.

Messrs. Watts have published for the Rationalist Press Association a new edition of *The Origins of Christianity*, by Mr. Thomas Whittaker (3s. 6d. net). The new edition is the third. It differs from the second chiefly, if not entirely, in having a long prologue—a long and, we must add, a rambling prologue. Perhaps Mr. Whittaker is getting old and demands the right to meander. He introduces many subjects into his prologue, but he does not dwell long on any of them. There is no question of his sincerity; but it is quite certain that he has not kept himself up to date on the origins of Christianity. It is also certain that Mr. J. M. Robertson, on whom he relies somewhat, has got out of touch with scholarship.

LITERATURE OF DEVOTION.

Messrs. Bowes & Bowes of Cambridge have issued a new edition of Dr. Montague Butler's little volume of Communion Addresses. Its title is *Lift up your Hearts* (2s. net).

Mr. Thynne has published a new edition of *Day by Day*, by the late George Everard, M.A., with a Foreword by the Rev. E. V. Everard, M.A. (1s. net); and a new edition of the same author's *Beneath the Cross* (9d. net), bringing the sale of that devotional book to its forty-third thousand.

Books on mysticism come pouring in upon us. The Theosophical Publishing Society has issued one by its President, Mrs. Annie Besant. The title is simply *Mysticism* (2s. 6d. net). The great aim of the book seems to be to encourage us to comprehend in our religion all other religions, not to love Christ more than Krishna, and not to love Krishna more than any simple man.

The Rev. Holden E. Sampson, after reading a good many books on mysticism, mostly of the theosophical kind, has written one of his own, which he calls *The True Mystic* (Rider; 2s. 6d. net). The title has a touch of dogmatism in it, and the book does not disagree with its title. But it is more in the manner than in the matter, and more in the matter, we think, than in the man. The volume contains three lectures, one on the mysticism of the past, one on the mysticism of the present, and one on the mysticism of the future. It is written as an introduction to its subject, but one must first be somewhat learned in its language before one can read it profitably. 'The transfiguration,' he says, 'was the result of the practice to the finish of the Four Tokens of the Mystic. By these means He transmuted the "*base metal*" of the carnate flesh to the *Gold* of the Spiritual Body.'

In *A Nation at Prayer* (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net) the Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, Warden of House of Retreat, Beaconsfield, has made a careful selection of Prayers and Intercessions in time of War, for use along with our daily morning and evening worship. To that he has added as careful and appropriate a selection of Bible readings and Acts of Devotion.

Vexilla Regis (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net) is a book of devotions and intercessions 'on behalf of all our authorities, our soldiers and sailors, our allies, the mourners and destitute, and all affected by the war.' It has been arranged, translated, and compiled by the Very Rev. Mgr. Benson, M.A. In

a prefatory note furnished by Dr. Casartelli, Bishop of Salford, it is spoken of as the last message of Robert Hugh Benson to his sorrowing countrymen. The book is in two parts. In the first part there are prayers for every day of the week—Sunday, for a happy and just issue; Monday, for the dead; Tuesday, for the dying and wounded, and those who tend them; Wednesday, for prisoners, the timid and anxious; Thursday, for widows, orphans, hungry, homeless; Friday, for sinners, and for our enemies; Saturday, for our Lady's patronage on behalf of our king and realm. The second part contains devotions general and particular.

It is with unmixed pleasure that we receive every year about this time a packet of books and tracts from Drummond's Tract Depot in Stirling. They are always carefully chosen, two things being kept in mind—their loyalty to the Cross and their Christian charity. This year the list is as follows: *A Modern Midas*, a tale by Mabel King (1s.); *The Laddie who came from World-Town*, a sketch by the Rev. Albert E. Dearden (6d.); *The Voice of Jesus*, an exposition of the hymn, 'I heard the voice of Jesus say,' by the Rev. W. H. Carslaw, D.D. (6d. net); *The Heart of the Gospel and the Preacher*, an article reprinted from 'The Constructive Quarterly,' by Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D. (3d.); *The Christian Soldier's Calendar, 1915* (1d. net); *The Winning Gun* (6d.), the story of a yacht race; and a number of other booklets for Christmas and the New Year.

A beautiful book outwardly, but a far more beautiful book inwardly, is Annie H. Small's *The Psalter and the Life of Prayer* (Foulis; 2s. 6d. net). Miss Small has taken the book of Psalms and shown us how to make it a Book of Devotion. Others have tried to do the same before; but nobody seems to have caught the spirit of the Psalter and made it ours in the secret chamber quite so successfully. There is piquancy in the fact that Miss Small uses, not the Authorized Version or the Revised, but a modification of the Genevan Version. There is an intellectual yet truly devotional Introduction to the use of the Psalter in prayer. But, after all, the book is the Psalter itself, arranged for direct and more profitable use in the hour of intercourse with God.

The Rev. G. H. Knight, who knows the Bible in the old-fashioned intimately loving way, has picked out of it the passages which speak of threes—three graces, three witnesses, three jewels, and the like—and of each triad he has made a beautiful devotional paper. The papers are not sermons, and they are not addresses. They are to be read quietly and alone. Then their fragrance will be felt, their spiritual strength also will be gathered in. The title is '*These Three*' (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

The Rev. S. D. Gordon's 'Quiet Talks' have made their author famous in evangelical circles above all the Gordons of our day. One volume follows another, and 'age cannot wither them nor custom stale their infinite variety.' The new volume is based on the Apocalypse. Its title is *Quiet Talks about the Crowned Christ* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). It is not an exposition of the Apocalypse; it is a conversation about the Christ of that book in His victory. And the conversation is not with books but with human life, every sentence having the appeal which felt experience gives, and every appeal being sent home with unerring directness of address.

An elaborate Life of St. Augustine was published quite recently. The Rev. W. Montgomery, M.A., B.D., has not published another. He is an ardent and highly accomplished student of St. Augustine's works, and in the book entitled *St. Augustine: Aspects of his Life and Thought* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net) he opens the treasury of his knowledge to us in order that, without half the labour he has had, we may have the same pleasure. First we are made to know St. Augustine the man, his character and his temperament. Next we are told the story of his conversion, with that psychological as well as historical accuracy which makes the saint's experience our inheritance. Then, after a peep into the intimacy of his letters, we read three chapters of psychology—much daring and much accomplishing chapters. We pass into a more familiar field in 'St. Augustine as Expositor and Preacher.' Finally, we enjoy an estimate of his Philosophy of History, his Theory of the State, and his Teaching on Social Ethics.

Is it useless recommending a book on peace just now? Is it not just now that it is most useful? *God's Paths to Peace*, by Ernst Richard

(Abingdon Press; 75 cents net) has things in it that at least must make us think. It has this, for instance. 'In 1843, which also in other respects is an important year in the evolution of international organization, the first international railway was opened between Cologne in Germany and Antwerp in Belgium. The importance of this event, not only as a technical accomplishment, but also from the point of view of international law, did not escape its contemporaries. In an article of welcome in the *Moniteur Belge*, the leading Belgium newspaper, in its issue of the opening day we read the following: "To-day two nations have united their desires in a common thought, and in a common enthusiasm. With joy they witnessed the falling of the bars which still are separating nations and have recognised in their minds that human brotherhood will conquer. The noble example given by them, the noble example which, in spite of all obstacles, will be followed by all Europe is at the same time the ambition of all peoples and the desire of all enlightened governments."'

Messrs. James Clarke have published a year book by the Rev. J. H. Jowett, D.D., under the title of *My Daily Meditation for the Circling Year* (3s. 6d. net). Here is one of the Meditations:

THE DETAILS OF PROVIDENCE.

'The very hairs of your head are all numbered.' Mt 10^{21-31}.

Providence goes into details. Sometimes, in our human intercourse, we cannot see the trees for the wood. We cannot see the individual sheep for the flock. We cannot see the personal soul for the masses. We are blinded by the bigness of things; we cannot see the individual blades of grass because of the field.

Now God's vision is not general, it is particular. There are no 'masses' to the Infinite. 'He calleth His own sheep *by name*.' The single one is seen as though he alone possessed the earth. When God looks at the wood He sees every tree. When He looks at the race He sees every man.

And, therefore, I need not fear that 'my way is overlooked by my God.' He knows every turning. He knows just where the strain begins at the hill. He knows the perils of every descent. He knows every happening along the road. He knows every letter that came to me by this morning's post. He knows every visitor who knocks at the door of my life, whether the visitor come at the high noon or at the midnight. 'There is nothing hid.' 'The very hairs of your head are all numbered.'

RELIGION.

Dr. E. A. Wallis Budge is surely the most prolific writer of the present day. How is it that he produces so much and produces it so well? Here are two volumes, each of which would be an ordinary man's output for a year; but they are only a portion of what Dr. Budge has published. The one is *A Short History of the Egyptian People*, with chapters on the religion, daily life, etc.; the other is *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians* (Dent; 3s. 6d. net each). Both volumes are meant to be introductory to their subject, and it would be difficult to find, far more to write, better introductory volumes. If they seem to err on the side of length, it must be remembered that their subjects are large, and that there is no greater mistake that a man can make who wishes to introduce a new subject than to omit all colour and detail. It is popular writing, but without the eloquence usually associated with that adjective. The illustrations are as popular as the writing.

The Rev. W. F. Cobb, D.D., Rector of St. Ethelburga's in the City of London, has given himself for some years, or at least as much of himself as his other studies will allow, to the study of *Spiritual Healing*, and now, under that title, he has published a moderately sized book, which is out of sight the most trustworthy as well as the most complete introduction to the subject that has been written until now (Bell; 5s. net). There is first of all a history of spiritual healing throughout the Church, ending with the case of Dorothy Kerin. Then follow chapters on Christian Science, on Spiritual Healing and the Body, on Spiritual Healing and Dreams, on Spiritual Healing and Suggestion. The last chapter discusses firmly and knowingly the relation of spiritual healing to the doctrine of the miraculous. The book is properly finished off with an excellent bibliography and a useful index.

What is New Thought? The best answer we have seen (and we have seen many answers) is

that given by Mr. Abel Leighton Allen in *The Message of New Thought* (Bell; 3s. 6d. net). If it is possible to treat the vague and very comprehensive subject scientifically, Mr. Allen is the man to do it. He knows all the varieties and he knows where there is anything among them worth calling Thought. He is a believer in New Thought himself, but he writes not to commend it so much as to explain it.

The danger of New Thought is to run into Pantheism. Mr. Allen is aware, but he is not able to extricate it or himself.

A valuable contribution to the study of primitive religion is *The Family Chain*, by John Hopkins, F.R.C.S. (Watts; 1s.). It is a pamphlet only, but every sentence is worth weighing. The purpose is to describe the evolution of Marriage and Relationships of the Australian Natives.

THEOLOGY.

The Right Rev. Frank Weston, D.D., Bishop of Zanzibar, has revised his book on *The One Christ*, and revised it thoroughly, before issuing a new edition (Longmans; 6s. net). He has omitted the last chapter on Personality; and he has inserted a chapter on the Virgin Birth; for the chapter on Christ's Consciousness he has substituted one on His Human Soul; and he has made many changes in the chapters that are left. But the most important alteration is the insertion of a new Preface, for in that Preface Dr. Weston deals with Modernism in a drastic and unrepentant manner. He has a clear conception of the demands of Authority; and, for his part, he is determined to obey.

Cheered no doubt by the success of their florin series of theological reissues, Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have resolved to reduce the price of some of their larger books and reissue them also. The first to come is Fairbairn's *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (6s.).

The Rev. George F. Terry, Rector of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Edinburgh, has published a volume of *Essays in Constructive Theology* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net). There are seven essays—on the Christian Revelation of God; on Modern Criticism; on a Working Basis for the Authority of the Christian Faith; on Progressive Revelation; on the Anglican Church; on the Anglican Ministry; on the Sacraments. Mr. Terry's object, as his title tells us, is not to raise questions or even to discuss those that are raised. It is, as far as in him lies, to 'strengthen the things that remain.' Nevertheless he does not keep out of controversial matter when it is necessary that he should enter in. On the Higher Criticism, for example, he speaks his mind frankly, saying, 'I am convinced that the first condition of the sound interpretation of the Bible is honest and thorough criticism, because ultimately all our religious discussions turn on the treatment of the Sacred Text. It is beyond question that within the last two generations much of the traditional treatment of the Bible has become impossible, and it is very saddening to think that much of the current preaching and teaching of religion to-day is only tolerated because the religious public prefers to remain in wilful ignorance of the assured results of Biblical Science.'

PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

Dr. W. Tudor Jones has written a volume on *The Philosophy of Rudolf Eucken* for Messrs. Constable's 'Philosophies Ancient and Modern' (1s. net). No one in our country has shown that he knows Eucken's work or Eucken himself better than Dr. Tudor Jones. A list of Eucken's works is given at the end.

Mary Whiton Calkins, Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in Wellesley College, is the author of two books which have been a great boon to the beginner. The one is philosophical, its title *The Persistent Problems of Philosophy*. The other is psychological, *A First Book in Psychology*. The latter has run through three editions. For the fourth it has been revised with unusual thoroughness. Some of the ideas and a good many of the expressions have been changed, and the bibliography has been added to. Altogether it is so altered that the student must make sure that he buys the fourth and no earlier edition (Macmillan; 7s. net).

Is Conscience an Emotion? That question formed the subject of the Raymond F. West Memorial Lectures delivered at the Leland Stanford Junior University in October 1913, by Dr.

Hastings Rashdall, Fellow and Lecturer of New College, Oxford. And that is the title of the volume which contains the lectures (Fisher Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). Dr. Rashdall's answer is that conscience is not an emotion pure and simple. 'Our judgments of right and wrong,' he says, 'good and evil, represent distinct, irreducible categories or ultimate intellectual notions, just as little capable of being analysed away into emotions, no matter how subtle or how much complicated by fusion with one another or how much directed by intelligence and foresight, as the intellectual notions which underlie the multiplication table or the rules of the syllogism.' Although the book is small, the answer is full; for the author keeps to his point, missing nothing that is relevant and introducing nothing that is irrelevant. While Dr. Rashdall is as convinced as ever of the rationalistic basis of our moral judgments, he seems to have been impressed by the reading of certain anthropological books, such as Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, and is inclined to give a larger space than before to the emotional influence of social habit on morality.

MISSIONS.

Messrs. Revell have published a handsome volume on *The Cross in Japan* (5s. net). The author, Mr. Fred Eugene Hagin, belongs to the Disciples of Christ, and is attached to the Christian Foreign Missionary Society in Japan. His object in writing the book has evidently been to give the friends of the mission at home some clear conception of the life and work of their missionaries, and in order to do that he has entered with some minuteness into their experiences. He has found space for some history of missions in Japan, as well as some prophecy of what Japanese missions are likely to accomplish. But his great object is to describe the work as it is going on at present, and the men and women who are doing it. Japan seems to be the only country about which it is impossible to write an uninteresting missionary book. This book, however, is particularly interesting even for Japan. And its illustrations increase the interest; they are not numerous, but they are admirably chosen and as admirably executed.

In *Winning a Primitive People* (Seeley; 5s. net) the Rev. Donald Fraser tells the story of his six years' work among the warlike tribe of the Ngoni and the Senga and Tumbuka peoples of Central Africa. We had already the story of the pre-Christian Ngoni told excellently by Dr. Elmslie; Mr. Fraser takes up the tale where Dr. Elmslie ended it and tells us by what means the Ngoni have been led to 'embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to them in the Gospel.' It is a truly inspiring story, most marvellous, most encouraging; and it loses nothing in the telling, for Mr. Fraser has the gift. It would be easy to quote striking passages, they occur on every other page, but it cannot be done this month. Let those who are looking for a good missionary book choose this one; it is assuredly one of the best.

'From the beginning of his career, Dr. Clough's strength lay in the fact that he so thoroughly wrought out his own methods. He had the typical American capacity of seeing a need clearly and meeting it promptly. There was a boldness in his methods that led him to hew a fresh track off the beaten high road. Other men, consciously or unconsciously, followed him. Students of missions believe that he inaugurated a new era in modern foreign missions. There were controversies over his methods all through the years, yet he and his mission stood unmoved. He felt the pressure of destiny which used him as a part in some great design, and often he forged ahead fearlessly when he scarcely knew where the path was leading him.

'The old missionary aim had been to seek the conversion of individuals; to get them detached from their previous life, one by one, and gathered into churches. Dr. Clough did not discard this aim; he added to it his faculty of getting hold of men. Early in his career he recognized the importance of the social group; he left men in it and Christianized the group. Family cohesion and tribal characteristics were factors with which he reckoned. And when, with the gregarious instincts that dominate an Eastern tribe, they came over to Christianity in families, in villages, in crowds, he was not afraid of them; he had become an expert on their social organization, and could handle the crisis.'

The story has often been told fragmentarily. It

is at last told fully and by Dr. Clough himself in the volume entitled *Social Christianity in the Orient* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). Undoubtedly it is one of the most moving as well as the most encouraging books ever written by a missionary. Perhaps the lesson of lessons which it teaches is that the oldest methods of evangelizing the world, even the Apostolic, are the best.

The Old Testament in the Roman Phrygia.

By Sir William M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., Edinburgh.

The position and numbers and influence of the Jews under the Roman Empire outside of Palestine is an interesting and obscure subject which has been discussed (to mention only moderns) by many scholars, such as Reinach, Lévy, etc., since Schürer's great collection of the statistics appeared. Even more interesting is the question as to the character, the religious feelings and beliefs, the conduct and moral standard of action of the extra-Palestinian Jews.

At present we are concerned with those Jews only so far as they are set before us in the Acts and mainly in the Pauline provinces of Asia Minor, viz. Asia and Galatia; and even there we have only to publish a new document and to show what important new light it throws on other memorials already known, and hardly suspected[1] to be Jewish. The present writer has had something to say from time to time on this subject, especially on the character and conduct of the extra-Palestinian Jews. One most important fact is the following; and yet his attempts to draw attention to it have failed (*Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 347).

So long as the Jews were living in a small country like Palestine, it would be possible, in the disposition of the calendar and fixing of the proper full moon for the Passover, to be guided by local conditions and actual experience of the first visible appearance of the new moon; but when Jews were coming to the Passover from distant parts of the Mediterranean world, and even sometimes from places outside of the Mediterranean basin, it was necessary that the calendar should be fixed long beforehand, so that travellers to Palestine should know whether to expect the Passover in March or thirty days later. Thus the sacred month had to be fixed at least in the previous year and published then through the Jewish world. For this purpose astronomical considerations alone could be taken into account; and there was abundant astronomical knowledge available at the time.

It is, of course, highly probable that the local conditions were observed in the traditional sacred fashion, and the first appearance of the new moon duly reported to the high priest, who then put out the proper advertisement of the approaching feast: but it was already known that the moon was there, and the day of the feast had been unofficially advertised in the calendar a year or several years previously. Without this admission of scientific knowledge, the problem of keeping the distant Jews true to the holy custom in the holy city would have been far harder. After A.D. 70, when the city was destroyed and the feast no longer drew the Jews to Jerusalem, the whole situation changed.

That there were large settlements of Jews in the Phrygian cities is well known. On one single occasion, about 200 B.C., Antiochus, king of Syria, brought two thousand Jewish families from Babylonia and settled them in the cities which he and his predecessors had found in Phrygia; and the statements of Cicero in his oration on behalf of Flaccus, the governor of the Roman province Asia, show that there was a population of very many thousands of Jews there in the last century before Christ.

Those Jews were placed there as supporters and trusted upholders of the power of the Greek kings, the successors of Alexander the Great, helping to maintain their hold of the country. Every foreign power ruling the country found the Jews useful and trustworthy. They were servants of foreign rulers, and therefore they were an aristocratic, conservative, dominant caste. This position

[1] My suggestion that they were perhaps Jewish (which is mentioned in the sequel) was received with scepticism; and it was considered that I was suspecting Jewish influence without any justification or sound reason.

powerfully influenced their character and history, and not wholly for the better.

The correct understanding of the position and character of the Hellenist Jews in Asia Minor and Syria is of extreme importance for the proper appreciation of Luke's history. Paul's work lay among them largely at his first entry into any of the great cities of Asia and Galatia; and the impression is forced on us by the narrative that they were present in large numbers everywhere he went, and that they exercised great influence. In Europe, on the contrary, they were less important, and had evidently a struggle to maintain their position: in Philippi they were apparently a mere handful.

The work of Paul in the Anatolian cities starts from the Jews, is conditioned by their attitude to him, and is often brought to an end through their opposition. They can move the magistrates or the mob to take action against the new teaching, finding various charges under which they can mask their religious hatred and wear the guise of vindicators of the Roman law. That law depended always on voluntary prosecutors to set it in motion; and the Jews appeared as *delatores* in the Roman courts.[1]

This character ought to be recognized more clearly and definitely than is usually the case in the commentaries on the Acts. The Jews had to appear in Roman courts either as Roman citizens, if they possessed the *civitas*, or as ordinary provincials. They possessed certain rights and powers in their relation to members of their own nation, and could in that way act through the synagogue against them as Jews; but they desired to inflict on Paul and his companions more serious penalties than their Jewish powers were capable of; and they had to subject themselves to Roman regulations in order to secure Paul's expulsion or any severer punishment. As Romans or provincials they appeared under Roman or Greek names, which they bore in the city; but they had another aspect in which they appeared to Paul and to their compatriots in the synagogues. That double character has to be clearly understood. In the case o it corresponds to his double name, 'Saul otherwise called Paul.'[2]

An interesting discovery fell to our lot in 1914, when my wife and I passed through Ushak on our way to Antioch the Pisidian. It throws some light on this subject, both directly and indirectly.

Those Jews of Asia Minor for the most part either died out, or melted gradually into the surrounding population, a unique fact in Jewish history. They were too favourably situated. First the kings of Syria, then Julius Cæsar, then the Roman Emperors, regarded them as faithful friends and subjects, and granted or confirmed many privileges in their favour. There can be little doubt that the Jews married into the dominant families. The case of Timothy's mother, in Ac $16^{2f.}$, may be safely regarded as typical; it is an incidental example of the flood of light which the rational study of and trust in that great historical work throws on Roman social history in the Eastern Provinces. Timothy's family was obviously well-to-do.

So much is necessary to explain the importance of the new discovery. A great deal more may be found in the three chapters on the Jews in Tarsus and in Antioch, and on Hellenism and Hebraism in my *Cities of St. Paul*; and also in chapter xv. on the Jews in Phrygia in the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, vol. ii. Here it need only be said that discovery has been gradually proving the view there maintained regarding the large number of Jews and their influential position in the provinces of Galatia and Asia under the Roman Empire. The task of tracing these Jews is very difficult, because they adopted Greek or Roman names, and avoided anything distinctive in outward appearance. Even in their epitaphs they are hard to detect.

Critics of those books have sometimes expressed distrust or disbelief in these statements, and have doubted whether Jews would hide their nationality so persistently, and those critics apparently hold that the Jews (whose existence in those regions can hardly be denied) have hardly left any known memorials of themselves, because they were prob-

[1] The term 'delator' was in the first century applied, almost exclusively, to one class of prosecutors, viz. those who brought charges under the law of treason in the interest of the Emperor. The Jews at Thessalonica appear in this guise, so familiar to us in the pages of Tacitus. But all voluntary accusers are equally entitled to be called 'delators.'

[2] It goes without saying that Paul had a complete Roman name, as to which our Hellenic historian does not inform us. Perhaps he was 'C. Julius Paullus otherwise called Shaoul.' See *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 31. The frequent conjunction of the names Julius Paullus (or feminine) in Lycaonia gives some ground for this conjecture.

ably buried in separate cemeteries which have not yet been discovered.

They can point to the existence of separate Jewish cemeteries in Rome. There is, however, this difference between Rome and Phrygia. The Jewish cemeteries in Rome are the burying-place of a humble and despised caste; but the Phrygian Jews were largely the nobles and the rich (as I have maintained). A humble and poor population clings to its distinctive religion, whereas a rich or aristocratic caste adapts itself to circumstances and refrains from blazoning the distinguishing marks of religion, even when it still retains the religion.

In May 1914 we found at Ushak two gravestones, about five feet high, in shape tall square altars, surmounted by a pointed ornament like a conventionalized pine-cone. One of these was unimportant in every respect, except as proving that the same form of gravestone was common in the place of origin (which, as will be stated, was Blaundos) in the period A.D. 220–50.[1]

I. One of these gravestones was inscribed on two sides: on the principal side there is a long epitaph of the ordinary type, stating the name and family of the maker of the grave and its purpose, and finishing with a curse against any violator of the sepulchre; on the other side is a recital of the honours in the state which had been held by the maker of the tomb. At the top of the principal side is the date, equivalent to A.D. 248–9. Then follows the epitaph:—

'Aurelius Phrougianos, son of Menokritos, and Aurelia Juliana (his) wife, to Makaria (his) mother and to Alexandria (their) sweetest daughter, constructed (the sepulchre) while still living in remembrance. And if any one after their burial, if any one (so!) shall inter another corpse, or do injury in the way of purchase, there shall be on him the curses which are written in Deuteronomy.'[2]

On the other side are inscribed the honours:—

'Stewardship of the market-place, corn-purchasing, guardianship of order, having filled all municipal offices and duties and having held the post of strategos or commander.'[3]

We were informed by a good authority that the two gravestones with some other stones had been brought from Blaundos, a city on the frontiers of Lydia and Phrygia, about eight hours south of Ushak. Marbles are brought in large numbers from the ancient sites for building purposes to the large modern towns like Ushak; but statements of the provenance of such monuments always require to be scrutinized. In this case the authority is good. My informant, one of the richest and most respected Turks in Ushak, had nothing to gain from false information; when he had no information he said so plainly: he was aware that digging had recently been going on to a considerable extent at Blaundos, and wished to take us there to see all that had been discovered. Moreover, the stones, though of a type similar to the Phrygian altar-stones, differ in form from the strictly Phrygian character (such as occurs at Akmonia); and an origin from Blaundos would suit very well.[4] I speak from careful study of the evidence of provenance.

This is perhaps the earliest writing that has come down to us stating the name of a book in the Old Testament. Older references to some of those books occur, but the handwriting in which the references were originally inscribed has perished.

The invariable Greek form of the name Deuteronomy is Δευτερονόμιον. Here the ι is omitted. This is, as we may feel certain, due only to local pronunciation, in which ι before a vowel was pro-

[1] A third was found with the other two, more ornate than the others, but of similar form and arrangement of lettering: see a later note.

[2] In July 1914 I received from Mrs. Wingate of Cæsarea in Cappadocia another copy (sent through Miss Dodd). The copy is correct except in the last word of the longer inscription and one or two small details.

The texts of the two sides of this stone are as follows:—

(*a*) ἔτους τλγ′ (anno 333 of the Phrygian era = A.D. 247–8). Αὐρήλιος Φρουγιανὸς Μηνοκρίτου καὶ Αὐρ. Ἰουλιανὴ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Μακαρίᾳ μητρὶ καὶ Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ θυγατρὶ γλυκυτάτῃ ζῶντες κατεσκεύασαν μνήμης χάριν. εἰ δέ τις μετὰ τὸ τεθῆναι αὐτοὺς εἴ τις θάψει ἕτερον νεκρὸν, ἢ ἀδικήσει λόγῳ ἀγορασίας, ἔσται αὐτῷ αἱ ἀραὶ ἡ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ δευτερονόμῳ.

(*b*) ἀγορανομίᾳ, σειτωνείᾳ, παραφυλακείᾳ, πάσας ἀρχὰς καὶ λειτουργίας τελέσας καὶ στρατηγήσαντα. The construction is so confused and ungrammatical that it is difficult to tell where the first three offices are to be treated as nominatives, or as datives with κοσμηθείς or some similar word understood, 'honoured with stewardship,' etc.

[3] The enumeration is stated in the most illogical way and in total defiance of grammar; the participles are τελέσας and στρατηγήσαντα, nom. and accus.

[4] The stone published by Director Th. Wiegand, *Athen. Mitth.*, 1911, p. 393, as found at Thyatira was made by the same hand as the two which we saw at Ushak, and must be attributed also to Blaundos. We saw it in Berlin, and recognized its provenance instantly. Mr. Buckler tells me that it bears no resemblance to the stones of Thyatira, of which he has made a careful study.

nounced as *y* and left unexpressed in the writing. There is not the smallest reason to think that the name was in Phrygian Jewish circles Δευτερόνομος, or Δευτερονόμος.[1] We should really read in the inscription ἐν τῷ Δευτερονόμῳ, leaving the accent as in the nominative and accusative of the name.

II. (564 in *Cities and Bishoprics in Phrygia*) was found at Ushak: I have not seen it: it is dated A.D. 243–4. The inscription contains a curse strikingly similar in character to the epitaph of Phrougianos; after which comes a legal penalty in the form of a fine:—

'And after the burial of me Alexander and my wife Gaianá, if any one shall open the tomb, there shall be upon him the curses as many as are writtten in (the book), on his sight and his whole body and his children and his life; and if any one shall attempt to open (the grave), he shall pay to the treasury in the way of fine 500 denarii.'

This inscription was brought from Akmonia to Ushak (as is the case with a large number of the inscriptions at Ushak). It is described by MM. Legrand and Chamonard as being engraved on a quadrangular altar, a form very common in Phrygia generally and at Akmonia: the ornamental top which is the distinguishing feature at Blaundos (see No. 1) is here absent. Accordingly, though the real bearing of the curse can be understood only through the epitaph from Blaundos, there can be no doubt that they belong to different cities. So in No. 9 we shall find an Apamean epitaph whose meaning was misapprehended, until the inscription of Blaundos threw an unexpected light on it.

The allusion at the end of the principal inscription is to the great chapters of curses, Dt 27–29. The curses there written are not specifically against violators of graves; but the same curses as are there written are here invoked against violation. Aurelius Phrougianos, son of Menokritos, therefore, was a Jew, and probably his wife also.

The same custom of appealing to the curses in Deuteronomy can now be recognized in a number of other Phrygian epitaphs, found in widely separate cities of central Phrygia.[2]

The reference to the curses in Deuteronomy is therefore a general feature in the Jewish custom of central Phrygia, and not a special feature of one family or one city. The Phrygian Jews were in the habit of adapting to the sepulchral purpose that part of the Law of Moses which they found convenient for their purpose without any regard to its forces in its own context. Such procedure is in accord with the Jewish way of using the words of the Bible. In this curse ἀνγεγραμμέναι[3] means 'written in' (the Book of Deuteronomy, or the Law of Moses). 'It is written' is a usual way of referring to the Scriptures.[4]

III. Akmonia (465, 466). I have hesitated much whether to assign Jewish or Christian character to this tomb; and I conclude 'probably this epitaph marked the grave of a Jewish Christian; but it would appear that the Church here was of a debased type, much infected by non-Christian elements' (p. 566). The doubt would now appear to be decided; the inscription is Jewish; the part that bears on our subject is as follows:—

'And if any one shall attempt after Amerimnos has been buried to intrude any other corpse, he shall have [to reckon with the most high God]'; the end is lost. On another side of the stone:—

'[If any of them] shall bury any other, may they receive the unexpected stroke which their brother Amerimnos [received]; and if any of them shall not fear these curses, may the sickle of curse enter into their houses and leave no survivor.'

This epitaph belongs to Akmonia, and the following also is from the same city; each helps to complete the other.

IV. Akmonia (563). '[If any one shall intrude another corpse], he shall have to reckon with the most high God; and may the sickle of curse [enter] into his house [and leave no survivor].'

V. Akmonia (565). 'Ammia, daughter of Eutyches, prepared the tomb for Salimachos her husband and herself from her own dowry; and there shall be a curse extending to children's

[1] I thought at first that the form intended was δευτέρο (for δευτέρῳ) νόμῳ, but although the spelling is very bad, yet I hesitate to think that ο could be used for ῳ in the dative termination at such an early date as this. Such misspelling might occur in the fifth or later century after Christ, but hardly in A.D. 248. I should add that Mrs. Wingate's copy has δευτέρῳ νομίῳ, but I took special note of ο in δεύτερο, and doubt if my eye (though sometimes failing to see small lines) could have omitted iota here.

[2] The complete Greek text of them all except VIII. is published in the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, under the numbers mentioned. I give here only the English translation of the part that bears on our purpose.

[3] ἀνγεγραμμέναι: ἀναγράφειν is used to indicate the careful entry of laws, etc., in a book or on a stele.

[4] γέγραπται is the form in the New Testament.

children prohibiting any other from being (here) buried except my son Eutyches and his wife.'

VI. Akmonia (566). 'Gaius [son of —] in his lifetime made [the tomb for himself and his wife? and after] the burial of these two whoever shall open or destroy or sell the grave, there shall be a curse on him extending to his house and children's children.'

VII. Akmonia (567). 'Ammia [made the tomb] for Gaius Vibius Crispus and Tyche her foster-parents during their lifetime in remembrance: after the burial of the two whosoever shall dig up the grave may an iron broom raze his house?: and [the same] to any accomplice.'

VIII. At Ushak: probably from Akmonia; published by J. Keil and A. von Premerstein, *Zweite Reise in Lydien*, p. 137:—

'Tiberius Claudius Julianus [made the tomb] for himself and his wife in remembrance, and Chelidon for her own foster-parents in remembrance; and whosoever shall do harm to this grave, children's children shall have the curse.'[1]

The suggestion which was made in publishing this group of inscriptions (see my *Cities and Bishoprics*, p. 652 f.), that the curses in them 'distinguish them from the ordinary Phrygian type,' and 'may all arise through Jewish influence,' must now be unhesitatingly accepted.

IX. Apameia (399 *bis*). This epitaph must now be interpreted in a different fashion:—

'Aurelius Rufus, son and grandson of Julianus, made the heroön for myself and my wife Aurelia Tatiana: and into it another shall not be intruded; and if any one shall bury, he knows the Law of the Jews.'

On this I suggested that the law which is meant must be some special law of the municipality of Apameia for the protection of the graves of the Jews of that city: my reason was that the Mosaic Law makes no provision of this kind, and therefore cannot be intended here. This view must now be rejected. We have here a reference to the Mosaic Law, and the passage specially in the mind of Aurelius Rufus was Dt 27–29. The fact that those chapters have no bearing on impiety towards sepulchres was a serious argument, when this epitaph seemed to stand alone; but now that it is established that the Phrygian Jews in their epitaphs appealed to those chapters, the bearing of the safeguard in this case is unquestionable. Evidently invocation of the curses of Deuteronomy was stereotyped as a form among Phrygian Jews; and the Apamean writer actually quotes the Law, as if the Law contained a rule on this matter.

In few of these epitaphs are there any names that demonstrate religious character or racial affinity. Even the names of women are pure Greek or Roman:[2] though, owing to the character of Oriental society, the names of women are generally more typical than those of men: for example, at the present day in some villages of the Hermus valley, where the men have for several centuries conformed to Islam and bear always Moslem names, the women use Christian names still. Only in I Makaria has the look of being, not Jewish, but Christian: the adjective μακάριος, 'blessed,' had become by the time to which these epitaphs belong typically Christian. Amerimnos, too, 'who takes no thought for the morrow,' though it has a certain look of Christian nomenclature, is quoted as a pagan name (*C. I. Att.* 194).

Yet among the names certain tendencies can be observed: Alexander and Alexandria are common among the Hellenist Jews, and it will probably be found that names taken from the Seleucid kings were also common. This may seem strange to those who think only of the Palestinian Jews and their hatred for those kings. But the Hellenist Jews of Asia Minor and Syria were friends of the kings. The kings trusted them, employed them as trusty colonists and adherents in their garrison cities of those lands, and bestowed many favours on them. The old-fashioned Palestinian Jews, who made the Maccabean revolt, were disposed to look down on the Hellenist Jews as too liberal and too much affected by foreign customs and Gentile ways.

Again, the names Eutyches (and Tyche)[3] point to the Hebrew Naaman; and Herzog in *Philologus*, lvi. p. 50 ff., regards Eutyches as a translation of the Semitic name.

[1] ἔξει τέκνα τέκνων ἀράν: the change of subject is awkward, and one might interpret on the hypothesis that this is an ungrammatical condensation of the usual fuller form, 'he shall have the curse [extending to] children's children'; but this involves too great a violation of elementary Greek usage, though these epitaphs are very ungrammatical (see the concluding paragraph).

[2] Makarios is a personal name in the fifth century B.C. (see Thucydides, iii. 100), and Makaria occurs both in mythology and in ordinary pagan life (see Pape-Benseler); but in the third century one would expect that Makaria should be Christian.

[3] Tyche is a shortened form of Eutychia, 'she who is fortunate.'

At Sala in Phrygia, on the Lydian frontier near Blaundos, there occur frequently on coins the names of Meliton Salamon and C. Valerius Androneikos Salamon, perhaps father and son. These are probably Roman citizens, with a Greek cognomen, and they often add their Hebrew name as a second cognomen.[1] As the names are all in the genitive, some might understand 'of Meliton, son of Salamon,' and 'of C. Valerius Andronicus, son of Salamon'; but Meliton and Androneikos cannot reasonably be regarded as brothers on account of the dates (Meliton, 100–117; Androneikos, 130–65).[2] The Hebrew name was an additional cognomen used by both those Jews; and we may infer that in many other cases the additional cognomen or alternative name was omitted amid the Greek and Roman surroundings in which the inscription was placed.

There is some probability, then, that those Phrygian Jews still kept Hebrew names in their home life and the relations of the synagogue as late as the third century: certainly this can be proved for the second century. There is a possibility that in V the strange name Salimachos may be a transformation of some Hebrew name: it would then be connected with Salem, 'peace.' The analogy of L. Julius Pius Salamallianus, in which an old Carthaginian name, Salam-Allah, 'the peace of God,' survived late in the Imperial period, suggests that here in Phrygia the name should be understood, Salem-malchos, 'Peace of the King.' The loss of the *l* before *ch* can be paralleled in the dialect of Greek spoken in Phrygia.[3]

Debbora is known at Pisidian Antioch.[4]

Thus the use of Hebrew names at least as alternative and occasionally perhaps as the sole name[5] is established as probable or certain as late as around A.D. 200. The Hebrew tradition was still alive at that date; and the general character of the Hebrew people would suggest that these few facts may be taken as signs of more far-reaching conditions.

On the other hand, these facts are all associated with burial, and the tombstones are without exception devoid of any Hebrew characteristic,[6] and almost all markedly Phrygian in type. It is evident that the Phrygian Jews had adopted in regard to sepulture the custom of the country, and refrained from placing anything markedly national on the gravestone. They were therefore becoming to some extent assimilated to the people among whom they lived. The inscribing of a curse against violation of the tomb was probably borrowed from Phrygian usage; and, while a certain difference of cast is given to the curse, yet this is ostensibly marked as Hebrew only in the two cases I and IX.

Yet there is no sign that there was any danger to the family in the confession of Hebrew origin: besides I and IX, there is a case where the maker of the tomb is 'Alexander a Jew.'[7] These Jews were a powerful body, and as a whole they enjoyed Imperial favour. They had much to gain by living like their neighbours, and they did so.

It has been pointed out in the book already quoted that the Jews probably so far conformed to Imperial custom as to become high-priests in the worship of the Emperors. This statement depends on the evidence of coins; and neither of the Jewish inscriptions in which the offices held by the maker of the tomb are mentioned alludes to a priesthood. Few, however, could be of such rank and wealth as to hold a high-priesthood, and perhaps also those who had held one would not like to blazon this on their tombs; for the fact would have been an outrage on the Book which they quoted, or had in mind, in the epitaph.

The discovery confirms some of the most typical details in the picture given elsewhere of the Phrygian Jews.

The incorrectness of the Greek in almost all

[1] Meliton never mentions his Latin names, but either the Greek alone, or the Greek and Hebrew names. It is only through C. Valerius Androneikos that we learn of the Roman citizenship and Roman name of Meliton. Androneikos sometimes omits the Hebrew name, and sometimes calls himself only by the Greek name: sometimes he has the Greek and Hebrew names without the Latin name. This case throws much light on the case of Paul otherwise called Saul.

[2] Moreover, the form *ἐπὶ Ἀνδρο. Σαλαμῶνος* is hardly reconcilable with the interpretation that A. was son of S.

[3] See the explanation of the forms *χακώματα, καχείτης*, for *χαλκώματα, καλχείτης* (dialectic for *χαλκείτης*) in Phrygia Galatica, in my article in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1912, p. 160, with note by Mr. G. F. Hill.

[4] On Debbora, Deborah, see *Cities of St. Paul*, p. 256. The tendency to retain women's names was naturally stronger, as has been said.

[5] Though Salimachos is the only name mentioned, the example of Androneikos Salamon proves that another Greek name may have been used in civic life by this person.

[6] Only in one case have I seen a seven-branched candlestick on a gravestone in Phrygia (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 651 f., No. 561).

[7] *Cities and Bishoprics*, ii. p. 652, No. 562.

these epitaphs is very marked. The Greek of the Christians was bad:[1] that of the Jews is quite as bad, and yet some of those who sin most were persons of high rank in their cities.[2]

[1] This is noteworthy in their epitaphs, and is animadverted on by Aristides (see *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 351 f.).

[2] In I κατεσσκεύασαν: generally the spelling is more correct than in any other of these epitaphs: εἴ τις is repeated unnecessarily; ἔσται has the plural ἀραί as subject; ἡ is written for αἱ. Three of the offices are in the nominative (or dative) ἀγορανομία, etc., then follow ἀρχὰς . . . τελέσας, but στρατηγήσαντα.

In II λοιπήσας (οι for υ), ἀνύξῃ (υ for οι), μνημιῶν, ὅσε, [ἴ]σιν: the construction εἰς ὅρασιν, etc., is rather mixed.

In III εἰσέλθοιτο (middle for active, was loved in Phrygia: see examples quoted in my papers in *Philologus, Neue Folge*, i. p. 755; *Zft. f. vgl. Sprachforschung N. F.*, viii. p. 389): so also ἐνκαταλείψετο (ε for αι): μηδίναν is doubly wrong.

In IV ὖκον for οἶκον.

In V the construction of the curse is loose: γυναικί for accusative.

In VI πολήσει and γουτάριον (on the latter see under VIII).

In VII ξάναιτο (see under III): [ο]ἶχωνα, if I rightly take it for οἶκον, is a *monstrum*. τούνβονα occurs probably for τύμβον in a Græco-Phrygian epitaph (Ramsay in *Oesterr. Jahreshefte*, 1905, Beib. pp. 79–120, No. XXXI, and Calder in *J.H.S.*, 1911, p. 179), so perhaps οἶκονα is formed from misunderstanding οἶκον as of declension III, and the misspellings χ for κ and ω for ο are frequent.

In VIII Κλύδιος (υ for αυ): τίς for ὅστις: ποίσει (trisyllable): the curse has an unusual form (see footnote on the text). The word γούντη (compare VI) is not Greek.

The words γούντη and γουτάριον are evidently names indicating the grave or some part or accessory of it. The latter is a formation from the former, in which ν expresses probably a slight nasalization of τ (a use of ν of which many examples occur in the country). The word may perhaps be Phrygian in origin: it is not Hebrew or Semitic (as Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy tells me), nor is it either Greek or Latin. Keil and Premerstein quote from an inscription of North Italy the word *guntha* (with *gunthariī*); and if this is connected, it must have been brought to Italy by natives of Asia Minor.

In IX οὐ τεθῇ (conjunctive apparently) the construction of conditional sentences is always a difficulty in these and in very many Phrygian epitaphs.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF PHILIPPIANS.

PHILIPPIANS IV. 19.

And my God shall fulfil every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.

1. THIS is one of those touches of tenderness which make the letters of St. Paul so human and so helpful. It is an open window into his very heart. He had known the disappointment which comes to men when they think that they are forgotten. There is a whole world of loneliness in the simple sentence, 'no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving.' He had graciously poured out his very life for them, and for the evangel's sake he was even now an ambassador in chains, but the Church's heart had kept no loving memory of his devotion, and her hands were not stretched out in greeting and in sympathy. Then there came the gift of the Philippians, and new joy filled St. Paul's heart and a new rapture gladdened his spirit. Their gift, surely, was a cup of cold water to a tired and thirsty man. Their thought revived him, their love heartened him, and their sympathy was a staff of support. What could he send them in return? He had no gifts to offer that human hands could carry. But this is his answer: 'My God shall fulfil every need of yours.' You have thought of me; my God will think of you. You have ministered to me; my God will cover every bit of your need with the wealth of His riches in glory.

2. God was not a far-off God to Paul. No more building altars 'to the unknown god' as heathendom did, groping in its darkness and longing for light, or, as modern scepticism does, giving up all search after God as vain, and glad on the whole that it is so! None of this in Paul, but the knowledge of God as one revealed, as one to whom he is bound by living ties of affection and daily intercourse; as one whom he can wholly trust! 'My God'—there is more than experience and confidence in the words. There is the sense of possession and the immeasurable dignity and strength involved therein. It is the old cry of David when he was hunted by Saul and had no earthly wealth and no earthly helper, 'O God, thou art my God.' No wealth? No helper? Ah, God was his, 'the Lord was his inheritance.' God was 'the strength of his heart and his portion forever.' So Paul could say that God was his, and with God all the open treasuries of God's grace and love.

Wonderful blessing of the Christian that in the darkest hour he may say, 'God is mine.' Wonderful help in his efforts to bring others to God, that he can say to them, as Paul did from the consciousness of his own great possessions in God and his knowledge of the infinite freeness of God's love: 'My God shall fulfil every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.'

I.

The Need.

'Every need of yours.'

1. Paul was led to write these words under the influence of two impulses. There was the movement of his strong affection for the Philippians. He regarded them with unusual esteem and love. His Epistle furnishes abundant proofs of this: where he assures them of his confidence because he has them in his heart, where he addresses them as his 'dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown,' and now in his closing words where, sympathizing with them in their isolation and the conflicts which were surely before them, he writes, 'My God shall fulfil every need of yours.' But he had also been touched by their tokens of affection for him. More than once they had managed to send him benefactions, though sometimes the opportunity had been lacking, and a fresh gift had just reached him through Epaphroditus. These expressions of their devotion had been very grateful to him. He felt that he could accept them without hesitation as they had been given without grudging; and, anxious to make some return, but realizing that it was out of his present power, he commends them to the gracious God, who had never failed him in the hour of trial.

2. Paul was very chary of gifts from churches. There were churches far richer than that of Philippi from which he would not take a penny. Mercenary themselves, they were ever ready to think others equally so. To the church in Corinth Paul writes: 'When I was present with you I was chargeable to no man.' 'I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service.' He was ready, however, to receive these repeated gifts from the church at Philippi, because he knew they trusted him and his motives. Epaphroditus, having delivered the little present, is about to return, and Paul seizes the opportunity to write them this letter, in which he heartily thanks them for their repeated kindnesses; and, as is natural, he sought to make some return. But he had nothing to send. He was a prisoner and poor, owning nothing in this world but an old cloak, a few manuscripts, and a Bible. 'But,' he says, 'my God shall fulfil every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.'

3. That we can ever reach a state in this world where no needs press upon us is not to be expected. We are needy creatures in a needy world.

(1) *Our needs are constant.*—This truth is implied in the prayer our Lord has taught us: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' To-day's supply is adequate only for to-day; to-morrow will assuredly bring its new demands. Certain of our needs, again, are of this extraordinary kind, that if they were filled up to-night they would be empty to-morrow morning. Some of our necessities are fresh every morning; the crop is a daily one, it springs up every moment. The grace you had five minutes ago will not serve you now. Yesterday you may have possessed great love, great faith, great courage, great humility, great joy; but you need these to-day also, and none can give them to you but your Lord. You had great patience under your last trial. Yes, but old patience is a stale stuff. You must grow more of that sweet herb in your garden; for the trial that is now coming can be sweetened only by the herb content, newly gathered from the garden of your heart and mixed with the bitter water of your afflictions. Our condition apart from our God may be compared to those fabled vessels that we read of in mythology, which were so full of holes that, though the fifty daughters of Danaus laboured hard to fill them up, they could never accomplish the task.

(2) *Our needs vary with the successive stages of life.*—The periods of childhood, youth, manhood and womanhood, old age are very unlike, and each is characterized by special kinds of need—the need for watch-care, for guidance, for strength, for patience. At every turn in life's journey new difficulties confront us, just as the scenes shift and change, and unforeseen prospects open before us. Our life is one repetition of needs, just as certain as the rising of to-morrow's sun, or the return of the seasons.

Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* illustrates this truth by the striking pictures which it draws for us of what Christian met with on his way. On setting out he needed the Evangelist to show him the path to the wicket-gate, at the Slough of

Despond the services of one Help to direct his steps to dry land, on passing the lions the words of the Poster telling him that they were changed, in the dungeons of Doubting Castle when hope was dying out of his soul, the key of promise by which he could open its bolted gates.

(3) *Some needs are very urgent and clamant.*—The billows and waves sometimes pass over us; and these dark things in life not only involve suffering and produce strange forebodings, but often impress us with a sense of mystery. We do not see the reason for them; they do not seem to be contributing to any desirable end; it is difficult to explain them as dealings of the Divine Love.

The conflict is deepened and rendered more intense by the fact that we cannot anticipate how these trials will terminate. It seems to us that they are fraught with a terrible fatefulness, and we feel as though life could never be the same to us as it was when, as merry children, we wandered in the daisied fields, or in after years tasted the joys of fatherhood or motherhood. But even these extreme vicissitudes of life, with their long shadows and apparently hopeless outlook, are included by the Apostle in the phrase 'every need of yours.'

There are moments when we understand these triumphant words of St. Paul. It is the one, almost the only struggle of religious life to believe this. In spite of all the seeming cruelties of this life; in spite of the clouded mystery in which God has shrouded Himself; in spite of pain and the stern aspect of human life, and the gathering of thicker darkness and more solemn silence round the soul as life goes on, simply to believe that God is love, and to hold fast to that, as a man holds on to a rock with a desperate grip, when the salt surf and the driving waves sweep over him and take the breath away. I say that is the one fight of Christian life, compared with which all else is easy. Let all drift from him like seaweed on life's ocean. So long as he reposes on the assurance of the eternal faithfulness of the Eternal Charity his spirit at least cannot drift.[1]

II.

The Supply.

'My God shall fulfil.'

There are many views which we may take of God. Some of them exhibit Him in such transcendent greatness that it separates God from us rather than brings Him into touch with us. The philosophic conception of God as the Infinite and Eternal may have its uses in broadening our minds, and rebuking the tendency which sometimes shows itself to regard Him as merely magnified man, but there is nothing in it to quicken faith or move the heart. The thought of God which is awakened as we contemplate the wonders of creation—the number of the stars, the forces which rule all things, the vastness of the universe—increases our awe, but is no help to the spirit in the experience of life. But the view of God which filled Paul's soul with confidence and hope, the specially Christian view of God, is truly a revelation to man's heart, and assures us that nothing which pertains to our life is indifferent to Him. He is One who watches over us and cares for us. Thus we are encouraged to look to Him at all times.

1. The supply is wisely *adapted to our need.*—Some succour which men offer is well-meant but ill-advised. Some cures for the ills from which we suffer are worse than the ills, being followed by the most serious results. But God so fulfils our need that we are richer and more blessed than if we had never known the need.

2. The supply is *adequate and overflowing and also sure.*—God always gives as God. No stinted measure ever comes from Him. Whenever you ask God for anything, expect more than you ask, for so always does God answer the prayer of faith. How many of us fail here! Swinnock says: 'We lie to God in prayer, if we do not rely upon God after prayer.' The Old Testament story of the widow in debt reveals no exceptional acting on God's part. The oil flowed until she had no more vessels in which to receive it. This is God's supply of His people's need—full to the brim. And then the supply is sure—'My God shall fulfil every need of yours.' No power of the enemy can hinder God. 'He abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself.'

Alexander the Great told one, who sought his help, to go to his treasurer and draw upon him for whatever sum he pleased. The man went out and asked for so large a sum that the treasurer refused to pay it until he had first consulted the king. The king's reply was, 'This man honours me by asking so much. Let him have it at once.' Brethren, our God is greater than Alexander of Macedon, albeit he was surnamed the Great. Many things may seem to be too great for us to receive, but they are not too great for God to give. God will stand to His promise. Our supply is sure.[2]

I remember lying on the bank of the Thames one summer day and watching the deep full river as it swelled past in silence and majesty. On the slopes opposite were herds of cattle feeding, which by and by came slowly down to the

[1] F. W. Robertson.

[2] A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, iii. 292.

water one by one to quench their thirst. One by one they drank deep draughts and returned to sleep in the meadows, and yet the river flowed past as silent, as full and majestic as ever. Its flood was not diminished nor did its waters sink a single inch in consequence of the demand upon it.[1]

3. The supply is *all-embracing*.—'Every need of yours.' When you have walked thoughtfully through the crowded streets of London and noticed the dense mass of people, you have probably asked yourself, 'How comes it that this vast population obtains an adequate supply of food?' Well, come with me to some headland on the coast of Kent—say, the South Foreland. The Channel is full of ships, sailing or steaming, and as they pass the great lighthouse, they are making signals. We ask whence they come and whither bound? We hear, in reply, 'From Egypt, carrying grain to London. From Calcutta, bearing rice. From Ceylon, with tea. From Ireland, with cattle. From Spain, with fruit—all for London!' You ask: 'Is this an unusual spectacle?' It goes on through every hour of the day, through every hour of the night. The fields of every Continent are under tribute to London. Then your anxiety for London's millions vanishes; the supply is quite equal to the demand. So it is with us. Rich argosies of blessing hourly arrive from heaven to meet your needs and mine. Along the invisible ladder angels are always ascending and descending. Do I need strength for daily toil; wisdom to train my children for God; grace to vanquish temptation; mercy to cover all my sins; faith to grasp all the promises of God; patience under trial; more life in me to adorn the Christian name; courage to face the foe; the fellowship of the Spirit; a strong hope that shall survive death; the full assurance of glory? All shall be mine. There never has been any lack, there never shall. Much as I have received, there is more to follow. 'My God shall fulfil every need of yours;' yes, all.

A missionary travelling in an unexplored part of Africa writes: The 'white man' is a never-ending cause of wonder to the natives, an inexhaustible source of wealth. My present carriers have had no previous experience with a European. The first day of our journey we were caught in a heavy tropical shower on an open plain. I immediately had my tent put up and all found shelter in it. 'Wonderful!' they exclaimed, 'he carries his house with him!' That evening, when we had camped, they were trying to light a fire by rubbing the point of one stick into a hole in another. I took out a box of matches and struck one. 'What!' they cried, 'he carries fire in his pocket and it does not burn him!' For their every wound or ailment I found a remedy in my medicine chest. One in agony from toothache I relieved of his tooth. 'He has a long bird's beak,' he told his friends, 'that pecks out teeth!' On a cloudy afternoon we lost our direction. I got out my compass and, after consulting it, showed them where the sun was. 'He carries a little god who tells him where the sun is descending.' Their wonder was unbounded when on the *capitas* telling me with a distressed face that their food was done, I opened a tin of flour and was able to give them a meal. 'He opened a little iron box and then poured and poured out of it an endless stream of flour,' he told them. Somehow I seemed able to supply all their wants and more. Their conclusion is that the 'white man' is incredibly rich and endless in resources, and their faith in me is pathetic. Their remarks made me think of Ph 4^{19}, 'My God shall supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.'[2]

[1] C. F. Carver.

III.

The Channel.

'According to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.'

The Apostle always centres our thoughts in Jesus Christ. Whether he be writing about God's forbearance to men in the past, or His grace in the present, or the dealings of Providence, or the purposes of redemption, it is upon Christ he concentrates our attention. So here, while he ascribes the supply of our need to God, he proceeds to add, 'according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.'

1. There are some striking contrasts here which are fitted to awaken devout musings. There is the contrast between need and fulness, between poverty and riches, between the time-life and the glory which awaits us. But let us fix our minds more particularly upon Him in whom they meet, and through whom the one is the passage to the other. For Jesus Christ binds together the need and the fulness, for He entered into the need, and He possesses the fulness. He joins the poverty and the riches, for though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor that we through His poverty might become rich. He unites the time-life with the eternal glory, for in the fulness of time He was born under the conditions of mortality in order that by the power of the Spirit, mortality might be swallowed up of life.

2. It is in Jesus Christ therefore that we must put our trust; but in order that we may realize the fulness of blessing which the text guarantees, there are certain conditions which must be fulfilled.

(1) *Our trust in God through Jesus Christ must be a simple, undivided trust.*—There are two mistakes

[2] A. C. Murray.

into which we are liable to fall. We look to Jesus Christ, but we do not so look as to really cast our care upon Him. It is a doubting, troubled look instead of the look of faith. It has been well said, 'Wherever anxiety begins, faith ends; and wherever faith begins, anxiety ends.' Another mistake is that of professing to look unto Christ while in reality we are relying upon ourselves or upon sources outside, which we hope will avail us, or to some fortunate turn of events.

We had a half-witted boy in the city of Detroit, whose mother sent him to market to bring home a basket of provisions. It was very heavy, so he asked a carman on the way if he might not ride, and he said 'Yes.' The boy jumped up on the waggon with the basket. Presently he took the basket in his arms, and the driver said, 'Why don't you set down that basket?' 'Oh!' said the boy, 'it is not fair to ask you to carry me and my basket too!' You laugh, dear friends, but we are doing the same thing with God. We pretend to carry our cares to the Lord, and yet we try to carry the cares all the time; whereas the blessed promise—and it means what it says—tells us, 'Cast thy burden on the Lord, and he shall sustain'—what? Thy burden? That is not what He says. 'Cast thy burden on the Lord, and he shall sustain thee.' He will take care of your burden and you too.[1]

(2) *God's care for us should make us sympathetic towards others.*—It was the sense of gratitude moving Paul's heart that drew out his feeling for the Philippians. Our care is a type of the cares of others. The Divine supply which helps us is a supply upon which they may depend. Trust in Jesus Christ should never be a selfish sentiment, it should enlarge our sympathies, making us brothers to all. By thus helping others, we become co-workers with Jesus Christ. It is often through His brethren that Christ ministers consolation and help to the needy. And what we do for others our Lord accepts as done unto Himself.

To open your heart till the pulses of the great world go through and through you, to be unwearied in kindness as well as in gifts, to feel, to love, as well as to do what custom requires—to see in the city and the neighbourhood, and especially in the poor, the unfriended, the obscure, the dull, the uninteresting, those who are to you a Christ in disguise, and whom to benefit is the one true and lasting joy of life; this verily is the path to eternal life, and this path *is open to us always*. In vain you try to make the best of both worlds; in vain by prayers and services and emotion do you try to compound for the harder demand which Christ makes—care for Me and for My brethren. This alone, this alone, is the path of life.[2]

LITERATURE.

Austin (G. B.), *The Beauty of Goodness*, 33.
Banks (L. A.), *Hidden Wells of Comfort*, 265.
Hackett (W. S.), *The Land of your Sojournings*, 157.
Jowett (J. H.), *The High Calling*, 222.
Lacey (R. L.), *Faith and Life in India*, 21.
Mackenzie (R.), *The Loom of Providence*, 198.
Price (A. C.), *Fifty Sermons*, iii. 289; ix. 385.
Spurgeon (C. H.), *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, xxix. (1883), No. 1712.
Christian Age, xlvi. 66 (L. Abbott).
Christian World Pulpit, xl. 90 (J. D. Davies).
Homiletic Review, lxiv. 394 (A. H. Strong).

[1] A. T. Pierson.

[2] J. M. Wilson.

Contributions and Comments.

Errata.

By an oversight last month the corrections on the contributions by Professor Moulton and Mr. Carr were not incorporated.

In Professor Moulton's note—
At line 9 read ἀγάπησις.
„ „ 17 „ συνάντησιν . . . ἀπάντησιν.
Add at end: We may put in the same category οἰκοδομή, for οἰκοδόμησις, but this achieved much wider currency.

In Mr. Carr's note—
At line 23 read κόλασις.
Add at end: For the Apostles at this moment pride of rivalry was the 'hand' or the 'foot' to be cut off, and 'salt' was the grace of God needed to bring peace.

Deuteronomy xxxiii. 2.

Dt 33[2b] (מימינו אשדת למו) is difficult.[1] All attempts at its explanation must be regarded as

[1] See commentaries, especially Driver's *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, in the 'International Critical Commentary,' 3rd ed., p. 390 ff.

unsuccessful. I should like to suggest the following interpretation. The whole of v.[2], I submit, merely describes the theophany, the appearing of God to Israel, and is to be rendered in the following way: God came from Sinai, and from Seir appeared unto them (unto Israel); He shone forth from mount Paran, and came from the holy myriads—*at His right hand a perpetual fire—unto them.* למו belongs to ואתה מרבבת קדש, and מימינו אשדת is in parenthesi. ואתה מרבבת קדש למו is parallel to וזרח משעיר למו (in the first half of the verse), while הופיע מהר פארן is parallel to יהוה מסיני בא (in the beginning of the verse). And מימינו אשדת is simply a further description of the theophany. When God shone forth and appeared unto Israel a perpetual fire, a fiery flame, was at His right hand.[1] The revelation of God was accompanied by fire. Cf. Ex 19 and 20, especially 19^{18} ('And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly'), also Ex $13^{21.22}$. Cf. also Ex 24^{15-18}, especially v.[17a] ('And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like a devouring fire on the top of the mount'), $40^{34ff.}$, Lv 16^{2}, Nu 12^{5} and *passim*, Dt $4^{33.36}$, 5^{19-23}. Cf. also Hab 3^{3-6} (theophany), especially vv.[4a. 5b] ('light' and 'burning coals'). Cf. also 2 S 22^{8-16}, especially v.[13], and Ps 18^{8-16}, especially v.[13]. The appearing of God is accompanied by fire. Dt 33^{2} merely describes the appearing of God when He revealed Himself to Israel. And one expects in such a description the appearance of fire.

According to the interpretation usually given to v.[2b] fire is not mentioned in the whole verse, quite apart from the fact that '(fiery) law' is an impossible rendering for אשדת. Moreover, the '(fiery) law' is mentioned only in v.[4]. V.[2] speaks of the appearing of God; v.[3] describes how all the tribes stood at mount Sinai and received the revealed words; v.[4] tells us how Moses gave the law to Israel. There is logically no room for the 'fiery law' in v.[2]. The various emendations (see Driver, *loc. cit.*) do not help either, and למו remains out of place whichever of the various interpretations is followed. The misunderstanding of this phrase (מימינו אשדת למו) is old (see LXX!), and it is no wonder that there is an אתנחתא under קדש. But this need not bar the way to a new interpretation. דת may be somewhat obscure, but it no doubt means here, as can be inferred from the remark of Ibn-Ezra on this word,[2] 'perpetual' (תמיד). It has nothing to do here with 'law.'[3] אשדת therefore means 'a perpetual fire.'

The explanation, which I herewith propose, yields a good sense for the words מימינו אשדת and makes the whole verse perfectly intelligible.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

[1] For מ (= מן) meaning 'at,' see Driver, *loc. cit.*, p. 390, note.

[2] Ibn-Ezra says *ad locum*: ומעם דת שעומדת תמיד.

[3] It may be that the meaning 'law' was derived from the meaning 'perpetual,' as the 'law' is to have a 'perpetual' validity.

'Art Thou Weary, Art Thou Languid?'

IN the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, reviewing Mr. Streeter's *Restatement and Reunion*, you quote the last verse of this hymn as follows:

> Finding, following, keeping, struggling,
> Is He sure to bless?
> Angels, Martyrs, Prophets, Virgins
> Answer, 'Yes!'

The penultimate line is in the form in which it appears in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*; but it has always seemed to me to be weak and unsatisfactory. The Rev. William Taylor, minister of Melville Parish, Montrose (*Twelve Favourite Hymns*), gives it as

> Angels, Martyrs, Saints and Prophets.

In *The Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer* it appears as

> Saints, Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs.

And this is obviously by far the best classification of witnesses to be cited in answer to the question,

> Finding, following, keeping, struggling,
> Is He sure to bless?

The holy angels cannot answer, since (we may presume) they have no experience corresponding to these conditions which obtain upon earth. And, as regards 'virgins,' the word is sure to be taken by the great majority of a congregation in its literal sense, with the concomitant depreciation of the 'honourable estate of matrimony,' the legacy of a mediæval spurious asceticism. Whereas

Swete (*The Apocalypse of St. John*) says it 'must be taken metaphorically; . . . they are the καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ of Mt. v. 8, the παρθένος ἁγνὴ ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ ἡρμοσμένη of 2 Cor. xi. 2.' To be sure, a congregation is not likely to make this (depreciation of marriage) deduction: the word is then simply meaningless to the average mind.

Anyway, it is bathos to make 'virgins' the climax of the witness. The *Hymnal Companion* line gives an excellent gradation:—Saints (the whole Church), Apostles (the chosen messengers), Prophets (the inspired preachers), Martyrs (saints, apostles, prophets who have sealed their confession with their blood). The climax is perfect; and the four classes as cited have a congruity with the four participles of the question.

The hymn is a translation by Dr. Neale from St. Stephen the Sabaite; but the translation is so free that 'it may fairly be considered an original hymn'; and the original Greek has now been lost, so we cannot learn what were the exact words used by the author. I have little doubt that Dr. Neale, with his predilection for the mediæval, wrote 'virgins.' Was it a happy inspiration of the Editor of *The Hymnal Companion* (Bishop Bickersteth of Exeter) that gave us a so much more perfect, and a truer, ending? However that may be, it is much to be hoped that that form may prevail.

W. J. PRICE.

Chapelthorpe Vicarage, Wakefield.

St. John iv. 27.

THE disciples may have been roused by this breach of 'Churchmanship' on the part of their Master. In any case, St. John has thought it worthy of record that they did not ask, 'Why speakest thou with her?' Their forbearance may have been due to lack of courage of convictions; or it may have been the result of a new perception, leading to a new conception of spiritual realities.

Compare this incident with the parable of 'The Good Samaritan,' in which the grace of Love is on the other side. And read with it our Lord's rebuke, 'Forbid him not,' when the disciples told how they had forbidden one to call upon the power of Christ because 'he followed not with us.' And, in the light (or darkness) of recent controversy, may we ask, Does Christ decline communion with all, save those who uphold a certain doctrine of communion and a certain form of rite and ceremony? If CHRIST now, as in the days of the Samaritan woman incident, condescends in Love—is not the love of party (so-called Church) blinding us to *spiritual realities as they are*? The letter—the mode of expression—killeth.

St. John 4^{27} will bear careful meditation and prayer.

WALTER G. WHITE.

Rupununi, British Guiana.

The War in its Relation to the Kingdom of God.

SOME lines of thoughts suggested as starting-points for conferences.

1. *The One Possible Alternative to Christian Ethics.*

> 'The new ethics discards the notion of love, ridicules sacrifice and pity, and pours a virulence of scornful hatred upon Christ Himself. Christian purity, Christian sympathy and humility, Christian gentleness and even courtesy are set at naught by the new apostles of the will to power.'—Figgis, Hulsean Lectures, 1909.
>
> The new ethics is now revealed.

2. *The Debt that a Nation owes to the World.*

> 'The dominion of German thought can only be extended under the ægis of political power, and unless we act in conformity to this idea we shall be untrue to our great duties towards the human race.'—Von Bernhardi, p. 77.

3. *The Inevitable Union of Races in their Political Outlook. The Quest for a Spiritual Unity.*

> World-Politics and World-Religion.

4. *The Necessity for a Redeeming Task.*

> 'War or . . .
>
> 'A thousand touching traits testify to the sacred power of the love which a righteous war awakes in noble nations.'—Treitschke.

5. *'Never again!' with whom will the Decision rest?*

> With Europe, or with Asia as well?
> With diplomats, or with the democracy?

6. *The War in Relation to the Christian Teaching upon the Divine Methods in History.*

'. . . In human history, at any rate, the greatest advances . . . occur in epochs or moments of crisis . . . "As in the days of Noah they were eating and drinking and knew not till the flood came," so it has ever been at "the coming of the Son of Man." In each such epoch we may see a partial Advent of the Christ, but is the Apocalyptic word amiss that Anti-Christ is also then abroad? Such times are times of tribulation, devastation, and demoralisation as well as times of deliverance and advance.'—*Foundations.*

'In an hour when ye know not the Lord cometh.'
'Look up, for your redemption draweth nigh.'

EDWARD SHILLITO.

Hampstead.

In the Study.

Books for Preachers.

IT is to be hoped that the volume of sermons in the time of war which Professor W. P. Paterson has published will have a large circulation. For there are not many things in all the crowd of war publications that are more calculated to enlighten our minds and establish our hearts. There is a certain fearless dependence on God which is at once arresting and strengthening. The soldiers in the trenches might read this book; and they would read it if copies were sent to them. The title is *In the Day of the Muster* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net).

In making *our* selection from *Selections from Brierley* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net) we fear no criticism when we offer—

The Joy of Living.

It is something, as a start in the world, to be convinced on good grounds that the Ordainer of our life on this planet intended joy as one of its chief products. That it means other things—service, sacrifice, education, development, probation, as well as a thousand aims beyond our ken—we may well believe. But one of its governing designs is the joy of living. If there is proof of anything there is proof of that. It peeps out of every detail of the scheme. Human delight, and not human only, but that of all living creatures, is one at least of the world's ultimate ends.

The happiness idea, while so deeply interfused into the constitution of Nature, is seated even more deeply in the heart of man. But the happiness material requires extracting, and for this there are some rules. The soul must in some positive directions be trained to enjoy. It must, for one thing, learn to be simple. The art of being happy is the art of discovering the depths that lie in the daily common things. Delight in the simple is the finest result of culture. The man of simple mind, of purged eye and pure heart, walks daily wrapt in the consciousness of being in the midst of a universe divinely beautiful, and which is all his.

The secret of the joy of living is the proper appreciation of what we actually possess. That kingdom of the unpossessed for which we so foolishly thirst is not half so good as this of what we have. When we have fairly understood the worth of our personal gifts; what it means to be able to swing along in careless freedom of limb, to open clear eyes upon the world's beauty, to eat with appetite, to reason, to remember, to imagine, instead of being reduced to the privation of these things, we find we are rich where we thought ourselves poor. The worst is where we lightly value our wealth in love. Multitudes of us are fuming in a false sense of poverty when close at home are faithful hearts that, if taken from us, as they might be next week, would leave a void that not the wealth of Indies would fill. We are only poor by thinking ourselves so. It is, in fact, our perverse thinking that every day makes fools of us.

The gospel account of Jesus stands out here as the typical, highest example. In the beginning was the exquisite joy of a pure heart in the presence of Nature, when the flowers and the birds proclaimed the goodness of the Father. At the end this soul, ever learning and growing, had reached a capacity such that the Cross, striking full upon it, evoked only a deeper harmony. The joy which, at the Supper, Jesus offered His disciples, was richer than that of the Sermon on the Mount.

And this marvel has continued. Men have learned from Christ how to find joy in pain; how to be happy when suffering and dying. To the soul that learns, life at what seems its darkest and its worst is realized as infinitely worth living. Courage, then, in the gloomy day. 'If winter comes, can spring be far behind?'

Be our joy three parts pain,
Strive and hold cheap the strain,
Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge
the throe!

The Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D., has preached and published a number of *Advent Sermons* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). They are not sermons for the Advent season of the Christian Year. They are sermons on the Advent of Christ, the first or the second. Dr. Orchard is a liberal theologian, but he believes in the first Advent and he believes in the second. He believes in the first Advent with all its wonder of the Word made flesh. In the second Advent he believes not as a literal physical event to be looked for in the future, but as a spiritual fact, to be realized now and ever more and more in the future, and given to ourselves to profit withal. He takes no liberties with the person of Christ. From what he has found Christ to be in his own experience, he does not think it likely that He was mistaken about this fact or that, or that He would have been content with any merely physical catastrophe.

Whether the Rev. James Black is as good a preacher as his brother, Professor Hugh Black, is occasionally discussed and disputed. Those who say no, should read the new volume of sermons which the former has published. They are his own, at least. Clearly he does not recognize the superiority of his brother by the flattery of imitation. And they have a certain distinction to which every one of them contributes its share. It is a complex of several ingredients, the chief being literary allusion and ethical insistence. One thing is very clear, that Mr. Black counts it useless to preach sermons that are without human interest. He is not at all careful to be orthodox, but he never loses his hearers' attention. The title of the book is taken from In Memoriam—*The Burthen of the Weeks* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

In writing an Introduction to *Memorials of the late Rev. P. W. Minto of Cannes* (Blackwood; 3s. 6d. net), Dr. W. L. Watkinson quotes some testimonies to the power of Mr. Minto's preaching. Among the rest he quotes the Hon. Ion Keith Falconer, the illustrious missionary to Arabia, who said that 'for a continuance he would rather hear Mr. Minto than any other preacher.' This greatness was due, Dr. Watkinson thinks, to the fact that he was distinctively an expository preacher. But he adds that to himself the sermon seemed always to be a blend of two qualities: 'The Orientals make music on a double flute formed out of eagle wing-bones. Mr. Minto's ministry gave the sense of strength and sweetness.'

Twenty sermons have been chosen out of the MSS. left behind, and we may judge for ourselves.

The Rev. Arthur S. Hoyt, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in Auburn Theological Seminary, has written more about preaching than almost any other man has dared to write. But it is a great subject. And after writing so much he was not afraid to choose the same subject when invited to deliver a series of lectures at the University of Chicago. These lectures are now published under the title of *Vital Elements of Preaching* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). Well, it is undoubtedly a good book; it is even a great book, and worthy of its subject. Being in the form of lectures originally, the chapters are eminently readable, while they contain far more matter, and that in a far more finished form, than lectures usually do. One of the lectures is wholly occupied with the children's portion, and a very useful lecture it is. Many of the great preachers to children are named—Mr. R. J. Campbell, Dr. Monro Gibson, Dr. Clifford, Mr. Silvester Horne, Professor Clow, Principal Garvie—and examples of their children's sermons are referred to. The things that are said in the volume have many of them been said before; but they are the things that we have to hear again and again, so great are they and so difficult of attainment—things like simplicity of speech, the sense of message, and preaching positively.

Those who have Miss Jane T. Stoddart's book of Old Testament illustration will at once place beside it *The New Testament in Life and Literature* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.). The two volumes are exactly alike outwardly; within also there is considerable similarity, the same sources being

often drawn upon. But the men and women who have fed upon the New Testament are not always the same as those who have been nourished by the Old. If the Psalms have appealed to Maclaren, the Fourth Gospel has appealed to Westcott.

Here is one of the illustrations—

1 Cor 10^{12}—'*Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.*'

Mr. Hare, in his *Wanderings in Spain*, says that in the centre of the Fontana de las Ocas at Barcelona there is a little bronze figure of a knight on a horse. 'This is not St. George, but the brave knight Vilardell, full of good works, who was permitted to kill the famous dragon, but who forgot his humility in the moment of triumph, and exclaimed, "Well done, good sword! Well done, brave arm of Vilardell!" upon which a drop of the dragon's poisonous blood fell upon his arm from the sword which he brandished, and he died. This is the first moral inculcated upon the childish mind of Barcelona, which is intimately familiar with Vilardell, who is again represented, in his combat with the dragon, over an archway in the street leading to the Cathedral.'

Mr. J. Ellis has published many books of illustrations, but he is able to publish still another. The new book is called *Straight to the Target* (Scott; 2s. net). One of the illustrations it contains is on—

Forgiveness.

'A deaf mute being asked, "What is forgiveness?" took a pencil and wrote, "It is the odour which a flower yields when trampled upon."'

'The Christianity of Heaven' is the title of one of the sermons in the Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon's new volume *The Veil and the Vision* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). The text is 'Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honour, and glory, and blessing'—Rev 5^{12}. So the Christianity of Heaven is the worship of love in sacrifice—the Lamb slain, the Lamb slain for us. It ought to be the Christianity of earth; it must become so more and more. This is one of the full-throated songs of praise which the volume contains. For Mr. Morgan Gibbon knows only one thing among us, Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and his knowledge always passes into praise.

'Some people believe that Our Lord Jesus Christ will, at some future time, visibly return to this earth and call to Himself His Church; suppose He came to-day, to-morrow, do you, who believe all dissenters to be schismatics, really imagine that in this country it would be only the members of the Church of England that He would call? Would He, in London for example, call St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey, and omit the City Temple and Westminster Chapel? Would He not call that great multitude which no man can number, of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues and sects and eras, who have realized their true relation to God the Originating Spirit? Is it not certain that the Church which believers in the millennium expect, would not be conterminous with any earthly or visible organization, but "as wide as the poles, as broad as the charity of God"? And if this would be true in the event of the Archangel's trumpet sounding to-morrow, it must be true to-day, and in not recognizing it, and in considering any of God's family to be outside the pale of His Church because they walk not with us, it is we who are guilty of the sin of schism and not they.'

So says the Ven. Basil Wilberforce, D.D., Archdeacon of Westminster. The words will be found in a sermon preached in Westminster Abbey and now included in a volume of his sermons just published and called *Inward Vision* (Elliot Stock; 3s. net). Archdeacon Wilberforce is rarely concerned with ecclesiastical things; he is too much occupied with the weightier matters of godly living. So is it with all the sermons in this volume, except that one from which we have quoted. But when he does touch these things he touches them in faith and charity.

Books for Teachers.

Messrs. Methuen have issued a second and cheaper edition of *A Child's Life of Christ*, by Mabel Dearmer (2s. 6d. net). The volume contains eight illustrations in colour by Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale.

The S.P.C.K. has published *Our Wonderful Cathedrals*, by Gertrude Hollis (2s. net). The illustrations are a surprise of beauty and number for the money.

Miss Gertrude Hollis has also written an Introduction to the Bible for the use of young folks.

The title is a popular one—*Our Wonderful Bible* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net), but the book is written by a scholar. Miss Hollis solves the riddle supposed by those who have never tried its solution to be insoluble, how to teach the Bible to children in accordance with modern scholarship.

A text-book for parents' classes, mothers' clubs, training classes for teachers of young children, and for home study, has been written by Edward Porter St. John, Professor in the Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy. It has been published at the Pilgrim Press under the title of *Child Nature and Child Nurture* (2s. net). To Professor St. John the training of a child is training in ethics and religion, and he is right. The text-book is tersely written. Questions for discussion are given at the end of each chapter.

The National Society (19 Great Peter Street, Westminister) has published (1) *More Stories for the Sunday Kindergarten*, by Hetty Lee, M.A., and Sibyl Longman, for children between the ages of five and eight (1s. 6d. net); (2) *The Good News of Christ*, being lessons from the Acts of the Apostles and English Church History, for children between eight and eleven, by A. A. Hilton (1s. 6d. net); (3) *The Church's Book of Days*, elementary lessons on the Book of Common Prayer, by Sibyl Longman, for scholars from eleven to fourteen years of age (1s. 6d. net); (4) *The Making of the Bible*, lessons for scholars over fourteen years of age, by K. L. M. Rowton (1s. 6d. net); and (5) *Thoughts on the Training of Children*, by Margaret A. Wroe (1s. 6d. net).

In America they know the value of illustrations in text-books better than we do, though we are coming to the knowledge. Especially do they know the value of portraits. A class-book of the *History of the United States*, by Matthew Page Andrews, M.A. (Lippincott; 5s. net), is illustrated with portraits throughout, neat little clear-cut cameo-like portraits on the edge of every other page; and below the portrait there is always a very brief biography. Besides the portraits the illustrations are chiefly of battlefields, an unexpected feature of a history of the United States. There are also some excellent maps, both in colour and in black and white. The book is written with a distinct perception of the capacity of the schoolboy, his capacity for being interested as well as for being instructed.

A book of *Nature Talks* for the use of infant teachers, has been beautifully written by Ethel J. Archibald, and as beautifully illustrated by Margaret A. Backhouse (Pilgrim Press; 4s. net). The following talk will give a fair notion of the worth of the volume:—

A Flower of the Land where Jesus Lived.

'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow.'—Mt 6^{28}.

What are our gardens looking like just now? Bare. Why is that? Because it is the time of cold weather. There are not nearly so many flowers growing out of doors now as there are in the summer-time. If we wish to have flowers in our houses in the winter, we must either grow them in the house, or mother must buy them from the flower-man.

Here is a bunch of lovely red flowers which I have bought. Show the children a bunch of red anemones.

These little red flowers grow out of doors in our land in the summer-time, but it is not nearly summer yet. Where, then, did these come from? They have come a long journey over the sea to us; for there are some lands where the sun is quite warm just now. It is like summer there, and many flowers are growing in the fields.

In Palestine, the land where Jesus lived, spring is now just beginning, and soon the new grass will come all fresh and green, and the fields will be covered with daisies and poppies and many of these pretty red flowers. Who knows their name? Let us look at them more closely, and we shall see how very beautiful they are.

Give one to each group of children, and let them notice its beauties and tell about them. Then collect the flowers, and let a child arrange them in a vase on the table.

Now show a picture such as Nelson's 'Sermon on the Mount,' where Jesus and His friends are seen sitting among the flowers. Tell the children that Jesus often walked in the fields among these flowers and loved them very much. Let them imagine what delightful times the children of Palestine must have had in such gorgeous fields of wild flowers.

They must have loved them as we do our prim-

roses when they come in the spring. When we see red anemones after this we shall remember that Jesus and the boys and girls of His land lived amongst them, and loved them.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Counting Ages.

(1915)

'How old art thou?'—Gn 47^{8}.

I wonder if any of you boys and girls have ever been taken to see a person who was very, very old.

Just two summers ago, I happened to be visiting friends at a manse, in a lovely part of Scotland. One glorious Sunday afternoon, the only son of the house said to me, 'There's an old woman in this parish, she's within three months of being a hundred years old; would you like to go to see her?' Of course I wanted to go, so we set out together, to walk the three miles to the cottage where she lived.

How frail she looked as she lay in bed! Her eyes were dim with age; but they brightened somewhat at the sight of the young man. He had been often to see her with his father. I should say he was considerably older than any of you. He had completed his University course, had gained prizes, and was an M.A. It seemed strange to see him, in the glow of perfect health, standing at the bedside of an old woman, so fragile that she could not be long for this world.

What do you think he said to her? He leant over her bed, and asked—'How old are you, Jennie?' He wanted me to hear her age from her own lips. 'I was just two years old at Waterloo,' she answered, with a pathetic look of pride upon her wrinkled face; 'if I live till October, I'll be a hundred.' That incident reminded me of a remark that I feel sure some of you have heard made—'We are twice children.' People ask the ages of little children and very old people. Have you had the question—'How old are you?' put to yourself? Of course you have. And your text is taken from a very beautiful example of a comparatively young man asking one who was very much older how old he was. 'And Joseph brought in Jacob his father, and set him before Pharaoh; and Jacob blessed Pharaoh. And Pharaoh said unto Jacob, How old art thou?'

Old Jennie counted her age by a notable event that happened near the time of her birth. I remember, when quite little, hearing my mother say of some one whom my brothers and myself reckoned very ancient indeed—'She was eleven years old in 1800.' Then a big, burly, strong farmer told my father that he was born 'just the year of the potato famine in Ireland.' People, you see, have quite a habit of counting their ages.

By and by you will be counting yours. Your mother may be doing it already. 'Bob was born the day the new church was opened.' 'Maggie came to us the year before father bought this property.' By and by, I said, you will be counting your own ages. Nineteen-hundred-and-fifteen! Not one of you will be able to say you were born that year. It will be—'I was ten,'—'I was eleven,'—'I was twelve, the year of the great war.'

The year of the great war, the greatest war of history! As you go on thinking of it, your thoughts will narrow down to something personal. 'It was a sad, sad year for my mother and father—Andrew went away, and never came back.' Ah, my boys and girls, there will be many different ways of speaking of 1915. One father I heard of held family worship for the first time, the very night he got the news that his oldest boy was killed. A young lady I know—she does not wear mourning—is bearing up with wonderful courage, although she has lost two brothers whom she loved very dearly. 'They have given their lives for a great cause,' she says softly. And the other Sunday, I taught a class of boys, eight in number. Those eight boys had in all about twenty relatives fighting for the flag. 'Please, sir, my brother's wounded.' 'Please, sir, I have an uncle killed.' Yes, you will count your ages from the year of the great war.

You are living at a time when to be a boy is the proudest thing in the world. The girls feel that, I know. And we older people—how we wish we could be alive fifty years after this! For although this will be spoken of as a cruel, cruel war, our nation will rejoice in it as a great fight for the freedom of the spirit. You are children of the greatest country in the world. It is but a little 'isle of the sea,' but there is in it 'a love of truth, a thirst for knowledge, a yearning for justice, and a hope of immortality.' Even if we were conquered—should Great Britain be beaten in the conflict (which of course will never be)—she would live on as great in love of home, and freedom, and

truth, in books that men will read, in the result of deeds of self-sacrifice. It is yours to carry on the work that has made her great.

I told you of a man who held family worship for the first time, when he realized that his boy had given his life for the great cause of freedom and righteousness. Let the year 1915 be to you boys and girls the beginning of days—the year that you enlisted under the noblest flag that ever waved, and with the greatest of heroes for a Captain. He was born about 2000 years ago in a little country town in Palestine, and at first was followed by only twelve simple-minded men—surely a small army. He carried no sword, and He had no gun. He said, 'I will conquer the world by love, by peace instead of war.' He fell amongst enemies and they crucified Him. But to-day, the name that is greatest in the world is not that of a king, but that of Jesus Christ. Will you join His army? If you do, you will never cease to count your age from 1915.

'Let the Blessed Sunshine in.'

By the Rev. W. Edgar Wallis, Oldham.

Do you ever read the newspapers where we are told how much sunshine we get day by day? If you look at any newspaper, especially in the summer, you will read 'there were 10 hours of bright sunshine recorded yesterday at Brighton'; or '8 hours were recorded at Blackpool'; or '7·5 hours at Torquay'; or '9·3 hours at Skegness.'

How is sunshine measured? By means of a little instrument consisting of a ball of glass or a lens, and a strip of cardboard held in position underneath it. When the sun shines through the lens a scorch or burn is made on the cardboard. When the sun shines very brightly, of course the burn is very thick and dark, but when it shines very feebly the burn is very faint. So, in the evening, by reading the burn, the meteorologist or 'weather-man' is able to know just how much sunshine his town received that day.

And the newspapers say all towns do not receive the same amount of sunshine; some nine, some seven, some perhaps only two hours per day. Is not that strange? God 'maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.' He is no respecter of persons, so He cannot favour one town more than another; and the truth must be told that if a town receives very little sunshine, it has only itself to blame. A manufacturing town, such as Sheffield or Blackburn, sends up so much smoke by means of its tall chimneys, that often a thick cloud forms over it, and the sun, however hard it tries, cannot shine through. Consequently, while at the seaside or in the country the cardboard is often burnt almost black, in a manufacturing town it is sometimes barely scorched. It is true to say towns get a great deal or very little of sunshine, according as they let it in or keep it out.

But God has two kinds of sunshine. There is the sunshine we have talked about, which warms our bodies, and makes the grass and the flowers and the fruit to grow; and there is the sunshine of His love which fills our hearts with joy, and makes us glad to be alive. We should always remember that only those who admit God into their lives can be truly happy. Without that enormous ball of fire in the sky the earth would be cold and barren, and unfit for us to live on; and without God's love we should be most wretched and forlorn, and the best things in our lives would die.

And strange to say, men and women, boys and girls, are like the towns of England in that they do not enjoy an equal amount of God's love; some get more than others, and some a great deal less. But what is most surprising of all, the latter kind of people are also like the towns with little sunshine, in that they themselves and they alone are responsible; for they too make clouds to rise and settle round their lives, and God's love cannot penetrate into their hearts.

Do you know anything of such invisible but very real clouds? Have you forgotten that day when you disobeyed father or mother? *They* were so grieved and hurt, and *you* were so miserable. Indeed you felt you could never be happy again! The cloud had arisen out of your disobedience, and stood between you and the enjoyment of that love you prized so much; and only when you said you were sorry and asked forgiveness, did the cloud vanish and the sun shine out again. In the same way the happy people are those who never allow anything to come between them and God; the miserable people are those who poison the atmosphere by their wrong-doing, and so shut out God's blessing.

How many hours of bright sunshine did you enjoy yesterday? And was it not your own doing if you received very little?

Let us pray every day:

O may no earth-born cloud arise
To hide Thee from Thy servant's eyes!

Entre Nous.

THE Prizes for Children's Prayers have been won by the Rev. E. J. Roberts, Melbourne, Derby; the Rev. A. E. Parkes, Whitethorn; and the Rev. H. J. Allen, Moresby Rectory, Whitehaven.

The Prizes for Boys' and Girls' Prayers have been won by the Rev. C. G. Clark-Hunt, S. John's Rectory, Barbadoes; the Rev. Hubert Ainsworth, Muswell Hill, London; and the Rev. Morton Gledhill, Ansdell.

The Prizes for Young Men and Women's Prayers have been won by the Rev. G. C. Gould, Stockton-on-Tees; the Rev. R. R. Resker, Purley Vicarage, Surrey; and the Rev. W. Hope Davison, Bolton.

The offer is made of a complete set (20 vols.) of *The Great Texts of the Bible* (or the equivalent in other books chosen from T. & T. Clark's Catalogue) for the best series of illustrations from the War, suitable for pulpit or platform. The illustrations should be sent in February.

English Literature.

Fitzgerald.

The latest addition to Messrs. Macmillan's ever delightful 'Eversley' series is a surprise. It is several surprises. For it is a dictionary, it is a dictionary of the persons named in the letters of a great French letter-writer, and its compiler is Edward Fitzgerald. In 1877 Fitzgerald told Mrs. Cowell that he was writing out for his own use a dictionary of the Dramatis Personæ figuring in Madame de Sévigné's letters, because he was always forgetting and confounding them. When he died in 1883, these notes had crystallized into a series of brilliant little essays. The MS. was handed to his great-niece, Mary Eleanor Fitzgerald Kerrich, and she edited and annotated the essays, and with the help of the late Dr. Aldis Wright, produced these two unique and precious volumes. The title is *Dictionary of Madame de Sévigné* (8s. net).

Pierre Loti.

If Pierre Loti's books were not well translated they would not move us. Everything depends upon the turn of a sentence, the choice of a word. Mr. Fred Rothwell, who translates *On Life's By-Ways* (Bell; 3s. 6d. net), seems never to miss an impression. And it is so difficult to use the English word with the associations that will give the right impression. This book is made of travel sketches—scenes described in a few sentences and never forgotten, faces hit off with a phrase and loved or pitied for all time. There is the description of the Bull-fight and the lean sorry-looking horse butchered to make a Spanish holiday—it will stay with us, almost haunt us, henceforward. Let those be thankful who have not come to it from the reading of Maeterlinck's story of the Elberfeld Horses. The book has a wonderful and not altogether explicable charm.

Addison.

In 1854 Henry G. Bohn issued the first volume of his revised edition of Bishop Hurd's Addison. The sixth and last volume was published in 1856. And all these sixty years Bohn's Hurd has been the only edition of Addison worth having. It looks sufficiently out of date in its curious speckled binding; it is more utterly out of date in itself. But now at last there is issued the first volume of *The Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Addison*, edited with all the textual resources of modern literary research, and in perfect taste, by Mr. A. C. Guthkelch, M.A., Senior Lecturer in English at King's College, London (Bell; 7s. 6d. net).

This edition of Addison is to consist of three volumes, and will contain all Addison's writing, except the Essays. The first volume contains the Poems and Plays; the second will contain the Prose writings; and the third the Letters, with a General Introduction, Commentary, Bibliography, and Index. It is an edition of the works of Addison, pure and simple. There is no introduction, and there are no notes beyond the various readings. Mr. Guthkelch has given himself to the issue of the best text of Addison that can be issued, and has restrained himself from criticism or comment. There is no attempt to catch the popular eye; all is done in the interest of our English classical literature. That the first volume should contain the poetry shows how little regard has been paid to popularity. For Addison was not a poet. One poem has lived, and the first verse

of another. That is all. And these are translations. What is the verse? It is this:

When all thy mercies, O my God,
My rising soul surveys;
Transported with the view, I'm lost
In wonder, love, and praise.

The complete poem is the rendering of the Nineteenth Psalm, with its sublime beginning—

The spacious firmament on high.

But that he was no poet makes no difference to our demand for an accurate edition of Addison. He was Addison, the good and the true. If he has been overrated as a poet—as a prose-writer he has not been, and scarcely can be overrated—he will be overrated still, and the world will preserve every word that he has written. Some one has been telling us that as an actor it pays to be good; as an author also it pays to be good. We give Byron less than he deserves as a poetical artist; we give, and always will give, Addison more.

Bohn.

Very easily can the ambitious but impecunious student obtain a good library now. When Carlyle recommended Bohn's as the ideal, it was an ideal little likely to become actual with many. It will soon be possible now for any one to have a complete set of 'Bohn's Popular Library.' Already three score volumes have been issued at a shilling each, and the fourth score is punctually delivered this month. Eighty volumes of the books that have lived till now, and are likely to live for ever—what can an ambitious student desire more? He can only desire the complete set, and with a little patience he may have it.

Here are the titles of the new volumes: Lane's *Arabian Nights* (vols. 3 and 4); Plutarch's *Lives*, Stewart and Long's translation (vols. 1 and 2); Monro's *Lucretius*; *Essays and Stories*, by Edgar Allan Poe; *Select Letters* of Horace Walpole; Keats's *Poetical Works* (the complete Aldine edition); Cary's *Dante*; *The Utopia* of Sir Thomas More; Schopenhauer's *Essays*; Coleridge's *Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare*; Washington Irving's *Bracebridge Hall*; Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Transformation*; Smollett's *Roderick Random* (in 2 vols.); Fielding's *Amelia* (also in 2 vols.); Hauff's *Tales*; and Lessing's *Laokoon*.

It must not be thought that the new 'Bohn' is a reprint of the old and no more. Many of the volumes have a new Introduction, and these Introductions add considerably to the value of the volume. To the *Selected Essays of Schopenhauer* Mr. Ernest Belfort Bax writes a Preface of fifty-three pages on Schopenhauer's philosophy. *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More* is edited by Mr. George Sampson, and the Introduction is written by Mr. A. C. Guthkelch. Munro's translation of *Lucretius* is introduced by Mr. J. D. Duff, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. This Introduction helps us to understand Munro as well as Lucretius. 'Munro,' we are told, 'was of middle height, with broad shoulders and a general look of strength and vigour. His hair, very abundant and nut-brown in colour, and parted in the middle, curled and waved close to his head, he had a habit of tugging and pulling at it while talking; he wore neither beard nor moustache. The forehead was remarkably broad, a peculiarity which had gained him the nickname of "the ox" in his schooldays. The eyes were blue-grey and very expressive, the nose large; the mouth was generally closely compressed and the corners turned down. There was something leonine—a combination of strength and benignity—in his expression. When he smiled, the whole face seemed to lighten up. It is unfortunate that the bust of him which stands in Trinity Library, a posthumous bust executed by Woolner, is not really like him. The photograph which hangs by the bust reproduces very faithfully an expression which might often be seen on his face.'

Books for Boys.

Messrs. Seeley.

The six splendid volumes for Christmas and the New Year which Messrs. Seeley have issued are all intended to delight the appetite of the schoolboy. And being written for the schoolboy, they will be read by the schoolgirl. For if there is any book that the girl at school dislikes it is the book that is written for her own benefit; if there is any book that she wants to read above every other, it is the book her brother lays down with an exclamation which means 'excellent.'

The first that comes to our hand is *Geology of To-day*, by J. W. Gregory, F.R.S., D.Sc., Professor of Geology at the University of Glasgow (5s. net). It is geology made easy, for the old idea that there is no easy road to learning is exploded. Take

trouble, avoid needless technicalities, write clearly and in good Saxon, add plenty of pictures, and the thing is done. Dr. Gregory has done it. His simplicity of language is never childish, but it is intelligible, and his illustrations are wonderful. There are more exciting volumes among the six, but not one of them has a more exciting frontispiece than this.

The next volume is on Physiography. Its title is *The Great Ball on which we Live* (3s. 6d). The author is Charles R. Gibson, F.R.S.E., author of *The Romance of Modern Electricity*, and other popularly scientific books. The great interest of this volume is in its description of the animals which existed on the Earth before man discovered it. The illustrations are again a great help to the understanding of the narrative. Our first wonder is that such animals ever *could* have lived even for one generation; our next is that scientific men are so clever as to prove their existence from scattered bits of bones. There are drawings, of course, but they are due to man, and man seems to have known only the animals that are wieldy and can live. Besides the animals, the Shells are here, and the Ferns, the Ocean and the Air, the Airship and the Aeroplane. The only thing that is not here yet is the Zeppelin.

The last of the scientific books is *Our Good Slave Electricity*, by Charles R. Gibson, F.R.S.E. (3s. 6d.). Here are the appetizing titles of its chapters: (1) What our Slave does; (2) Where did we find Electricity? (3) The Taming of the Slave; (4) How our Slave carries Messages; (5) Electricity rescues Ships at Sea; (6) How our Slave carries a Spoken Message; (7) How Electricity lights our Streets and Houses; (8) How we get our Slave to do Hard Work; (9) How our Slave pushes Street-Cars along; (10) More Hard Work for our Slave; (11) How Electricity rings Bells and works Railway Signals; (12) Silver Teapots for Common Metal Ones; (13) Our Slave as a Doctor's Assistant; (14) Other Things that Electricity does; (15) What is Electricity like? What is electricity like—how does Mr. Gibson answer that? He answers it partly in this way: 'We have no doubt whatever that electricity is a real thing, and that it is made up of separate very small particles. Particles of what? If I answer that they are particles of electricity, my answer is not unlike that of the schoolboy who was asked the meaning of the word *ratio*. He replied that it meant *proportion*. His teacher then asked him the meaning of the word *proportion*, and he replied that it meant *ratio*. What, then, are the meanings of the words *ratio* and *proportion*, asked the teacher, whereupon the boy replied that he was sorry he could answer only one question at a time.'

Of the three volumes that remain one is a clever sympathetic biography of 'Pennell of the Afghan Frontier,' told for boys, off the large book, by Alice M. Pennell, M.B., B.S.(Lond.), B.Sc., who wrote the large biography also. The title of the book is *A Hero of the Afghan Frontier* (2s. 6d.). For inspiration of life and the making of character in boys this is the book of them all.

The Romance of Piracy, by E. Keble Chatterton, B.A. (5s.), speaks for itself—that is to say, its title does. If not, its illustrations do. They are all highly imaginative. Every pirate, filibuster, and buccaneer is dressed in clothes of the best cut and most gorgeous colouring, no matter what he is doing, and he is often doing very dirty work.

Last of all comes a mere story. It is the story of *Ian Hardy, Midshipman* (5s.), and it has been written by Commander E. Hamilton Currey, R.N., who no doubt was once a middy himself and knows well. We are all much concerned about our midshipmen in these days, and not a little proud of them. This is a well-told story of a midshipman who had many adventures and came out of them all. Again, the illustrations are a great feature of the book, and they are all in colour this time. Those who have read the early adventures of Ian Hardy told in *Ian Hardy, Naval Cadet*, will be glad to know that the after history of their hero is to be found in this volume.

The S.P.C.K.

The Secretary of the S.P.C.K. must have settled what his boys' books for Christmas and the New Year would be before the war began. It is therefore extraordinary that two of them should be so warlike. It is more extraordinary that these two should both be tales of Waterloo. If our soldiers have any time for reading they will not despise boys' books if sent to them, and the reading of these great deeds will delight them. Their titles are *For England! For France!* by Frederick Harrison (3s. 6d.); and *A Boy of the Old Brigade*, by John Graeme (2s.).

The S.P.C.K. books for the New Year would not be complete without a volume by Herbert Hayens and one by John A. Higginson. So here

they are—*An Amazing Conspiracy* from the former (2s. 6d.), and *A Strange Craft* from the latter (2s.). Both are spiced with adventure, and more than spiced, they are compounded of adventure. For the boys will have it so, little boys and big boys.

A grand boys' book is *The Voyages of Captain Scott* (Smith, Elder & Co.; 6s. net), as retold by Mr. Charles Turley from *The Voyage of the 'Discovery'* and *Scott's Last Expedition*. Far before all the tales of adventure, however well told, is this narrative of actual and awful experience, so much better told in its truth and modesty. Mr. Turley has intruded nowhere; he has let Scott speak, and he has let Scott and his fellows be seen. The publishers have produced the book attractively. There is a photogravure plate giving a fine portrait of Captain Scott; there are four coloured plates, and there are many other full-page plates. Sir J. M. Barrie, Bart., has written a fine appreciation by way of Introduction to the book.

The first volume of *The Standard History of the War* has been published by Messrs. Newnes (1s. net). It is a small volume with a few good portraits, written simply and credibly by Mr. Edgar Wallace, and containing some excellent anecdotes. It carries the history down to the battle of the Aisne.

Poetry, New and Old.

The Songs of the Tuscan Hills.

We owe some of our most charming introductions to out-of-the-way literature to Miss Grace Warrack, and she has crowned her work with the issue of a volume entitled *Florilegio di Canti Toscani: Folk-Songs of the Tuscan Hills* (Alexander Moring; 10s. 6d. net). The book as a book is a pleasure to handle. Its illustrations in colour, too, are quite exceptionally attractive. It is Miss Warrack's way to write full introductions to her books. Here is an introduction of eighty pages, and all the writing in it is fresh in style as in matter. For the introduction alone the book would be noteworthy, making it one of the most original gift-books of the season. Then the folk-songs are very many, and they are translated with a rare combination of fidelity and right atmosphere. They are divided into (1) Respectful Songs of Love; (2) Lovers' Songs of Diverse Emotions; (3) Lullabies; (4) Children's Songs and Prayers; (5) Songs of Sacred Story; and (6) Songs of the Soul. Here is one of the Lullabies, one of the Children's Prayers, and the Prelude for Songs of the Soul.

MOTHER'S SONG.

Slumber soft be thine,
Sweet budded-rose of mine.
Sleep thou and still repose,
My sweet new-budded rose.
Move not these restless feet,
My rose new-budded, sweet.
Thy mother's joy a-shine,
Sweet budded-rose of mine.

A CHILD'S PRAYER OF PENITENCE.

Jesu mine, of love aflame,
Would I had not earned Thy blame—
Nor in deed, nor yet in word!
Thee my heart I give, O Lord.
Jesu mine, so holy, good,
Thee for pardon pray I would
For my sins both first and last
In the present and the past.
Jesu mine, whom I adore,
I will ne'er offend Thee more.

O HAPPY DAY THAT FIXED MY CHOICE.

Beauteous the day that broke upon me there
And for its beauteousness God praisëd be!
About the roads He met me, Jesu fair,
He bent His gracious head and smiled on me.
Then slipped the key from out my bosom's care:
—Lord, for my love, this take and keep with Thee.

John Galsworthy.

Some Slings and Arrows have been selected by Elsie E. Morton from the writings of John Galsworthy (Elkin Mathews; 1s. net). We may be allowed to quote two of the selections, one from 'The Inn of Tranquillity,' and one from 'Persia-Moritura':

'Is not hypocrisy just a product of tenacity, which is again the lower part of courage? Is not hypocrisy but an active sense of property in one's good name, the clutching close of respectability at any price, the feeling that one must not part, even at the cost of truth, with what he has sweated so to gain?'

Is Freedom but a word—a flaring boast?
Is self-concern horizon's utter sum?
If so—To-day let England die, and ghost
Through all her godless history to come!
If, Sirs, the faith of men be Force alone.
Let us ring down—the face is nothing worth!

Geoffrey Winthrop Young.

There is perhaps not a great deal for the preacher in *Freedom*—Poems by Geoffrey Winthrop Young, which Messrs. Smith, Elder & Co. have published (5s. net). But what there is is excellent, as the poem we shall quote will prove. In any case, there is poetry, and nothing else, with almost a Swinburnian command of rhyme, and more than a Swinburnian control of thinking.

FOR ANY BOY.

I wish for him
strength; that he may be strong in every limb,
stubborn and fearless, with no cover to thank,
fighting for men with men in the front rank.

I wish him kind;
that he may have the weak always in mind:
such kindness as first treads the path of fear,
not tendance on the wounded in the rear.

I'd have him grow
deep-breathed, deep-hearted, cherished of wind
and snow;
loving delightful laughter, and harsh thrills
in summer rivers and on perilous hills.

I wish him sight;
that he may read the world's real beauties
right:
and for himself, wit and a laughing heart,
lest he may rage to bear so small a part.

I wish him thought;
that he may fashion faith even to a nought,
rather than take another's creed on trust,
and pass a fool and profitless to dust.

I'd have him range
a rebel, loving change only for change;
till he can forge a yoke for his broad back
and drag his kind one step up some new track.

Let him know men,
and have all acts, all passions in his ken:
they win no wars who peep on life askance
and shoot wise saws from sheltered ignorance.

Let him be flame,
quenchless and vital, in all winds the same;
fuse soul and body, and refine through years
judgment from passion, joy from his burning tears.

So let him live:
love work, love rest, love all that life can give;
and when he grows too weary to feel joy,
leave life, with laughter, to some other boy.

Lionel Birch.

Mr. Birch is an experimenter in metre, and sometimes an experimenter in poetry. His range is considerable, as the title *Dreams and Realities* (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net) shows. Some truly beautiful nature-poetry will be found in the book, but the best of it, and it is often so, is the poetry that is touched with the passion of love. We shall quote one poem only; we think it is the shortest in the whole volume:

THE LORDS OF LIFE.

For some, the midnight magic of the skies
No spirit-sight unbars,
And, thro' the darkest cloud-veil, other eyes
See Heaven splash'd with stars!

To some, Life with its pageantry and gleam
No festal joy imparts,
And some are lords of all its zest and dream
And know its heart of hearts!

Child Songs.

Another volume of Carey Bonner's *Child Songs* has been published at the Pilgrim Press (2s. net). The songs are of all poetical and non-poetical values, but they are all suitable for children, whereas the children's hymns in our hymnaries are often unpoetical and suitable only for the aged. The music is more uniformly good, sometimes sweet and haunting.

Two Anthologies.

Messrs. A. & C. Black have published a little anthology of verse under the title of *Nature's Moods*, and another under the title of *The Call of the Open* (2s. 6d. net each). Both are compiled by Mr. Leonard Stowell. The little books are daintily got up and contain a number of charming illustrations in colour. The poetry in them is mostly well known; the least known being the

translations of foreign authors made by Mr. Jethro Bithell. Here is one of them:

WINDS TORMENT THE TREES.

Winds torment the trees,
The leaves yellow, shrivel, freeze.

Men, still brown their summer cheek,
And yet their lips the last word speak,
The song is near its lees.

MAXIMILIAN DAUTHENDEY.

Mr. Thomas Burke has read the books of all optimistic writers he can think of and gathered extracts out of them. *The Contented Mind* (Truslove & Hanson; 2s. 6d. net) is therefore an anthology of optimism. According to the divisions of his book, there are three ways of obtaining a contented mind. One way is to have material plenty; another way is to have a merry heart; and the third way is to have a steadfast soul. This is what is said by an anonymous steadfast soul:

OUR LITTLE NEED.

This is the height of our deserts:
A little pity for life's hurts:
A little rain, a little sun,
A little sleep when work is done.

A little righteous punishment,
Less for our deeds than their intent;
A little pardon now and then,
Because we are but struggling men.

A little light to show the way,
A little guidance where we stray:
A little love before we pass
To rest beneath the kirkyard grass.

A little faith in days of change,
When life is stark and bare and strange;
A solace when our eyes are wet
With tears of longing and regret.

True it is that we cannot claim
Unmeasured recompense or blame,
Because our way of life is small:
A little is the sum of all.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. A. C. Murray, Stellenbosch, S. Africa.

Illustrations for the Great Text for February must be received by the 20th of December. The text is Ro 8^{28}.

The Great Text for March is Ro $7^{24.25}$—'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for April is Ac 26^{28}—'And Agrippa said unto Paul, With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian.' A copy of Law's *The Tests of Life*, or of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, and Shaw's *Christianity as Religion and Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for May is Ph 2^{5-8}—'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of Lithgow's *The Parabolic Gospel*, and Coats's *The Christian Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for June is Ph 2^{9-11}—'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is known that science and theology have recently been drawing more closely together. It is at any rate known that they have ceased to eye one another with the old unsleeping antagonism. How has the change come about? The causes are many, and not always easy to trace. But one cause is the interest that scientific men have been taking in the existence of a future life.

That interest is not due to Christianity. The believer in Christ has no more doubt of a future life than he has of the present life. 'In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.' Christ spoke these words and others like them. And not only did He speak plain words like these, but He lived a life on earth every act of which took a future life for granted. The believer in Christ has no doubt that if a man die he shall live again.

But the new interest in the future which men of science show has not come from Christ. Some of them take an interest in theology. But that is an afterthought. It is the result, it is not the occasion, of their interest in a life to come. The new interest in the future is due to the discovery that physical science cannot explain everything.

This is a genuine discovery. And it is now accepted by almost everybody. It is accepted even by Sir Edwin Ray Lankester. In an article in *The R. P. A. Annual* for 1915, he accepts the limitation of science without reserve. He expresses it mathematically. He suggests that we might regard the results of science as the contents of a bracket, as used in algebra. Inside the bracket he would place all the ascertained and ascertainable facts of physical science; outside it the facts (if they may be called facts) of religion and theology. And he has no hesitation either in confining science within the bracket or in acknowledging his interest in whatever may be without.

But there must be no confusion between the two. If the contents of the bracket are to be confined within it, the things that are without must not enter in. Sir Edwin Ray Lankester has written this article for the purpose of protesting against any attempt that may be made to arrive at the knowledge of a future life by the methods of physical science.

For it seems to him that all the progress which has been made by science during the last two hundred and fifty years has been made by rigidly adhering to the scientific method. What is that? It is the method of 'not blindly accepting a guess or belief as to the causes or relations of observed occurrences, but of at once testing such guess or

belief by framing an inference from it, the truth of which inference could be put to the proof of actual observation.' The Royal Society was founded in 1662. It was founded for the purpose of putting the scientific method into operation. And to the application of the scientific method, says Sir Edwin Ray Lankester, is due the whole of that vast mass of knowledge of physics, chemistry, and biology which has accumulated since the Royal Society was founded. He does not deny that some of the founders, and some of those who succeeded them, had no clear conception of the scientific method, or were not always careful to apply it. They had their own religious beliefs and theological speculations, and they often allowed them to interfere with the working of the method of science. But in so far as they did so, they retarded progress. The method of science is to observe physical facts, to classify them, to draw legitimate conclusions from them, and to insist at every step on the production of 'cases' which can be tested.

Now it so happened that at the last meeting but one of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, the President, Sir Oliver Lodge, forgot this fundamental rule. In his presidential address he expressed his personal belief in the existence of ghosts. He did not use that word. He spoke of 'discarnate intelligences.' But Sir Edwin Ray Lankester says that by 'discarnate intelligences' he meant what ordinary people would call ghosts. And ghosts he himself prefers to call them.

But why should not Sir Oliver Lodge express his personal belief in the existence of ghosts? Sir Edwin Ray Lankester does not deny his right—on another occasion. It is his right to do so at the meetings of the British Association that he denies. It is his right as President and in his Presidential Address. For it is understood that nothing shall be mentioned at the meetings of the British Association but that which is found inside Sir Edwin Ray Lankester's algebraical bracket.

Is this an act of intolerance on the part of Sir Edwin Ray Lankester? He says it is not. He says that his objection is not made to a belief which he does not share. It is not made because he denies the existence of ghosts. He does not deny their existence. He does not know whether they exist or not. What he objects to is that Sir Oliver Lodge at a scientific meeting introduced them unscientifically. He did not produce an example. He did not make it possible for the men of science who were present to test his belief. In the early days of the Association there were men who wished to introduce matters of doubtful disputation. The members insisted that they must 'bring in' an experiment or a specimen. They insisted that the vampire and the dragon should be placed "on the table," that angels should be brought before them, and their power of dancing on a needle's point exhibited, before they would discuss these things at all.' And because Sir Oliver Lodge did not observe this rule his Presidential address is condemned as unscientific and retrogressive.

One of the reasons for the publication of The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics was the arrest that had taken place in the progress of Theology. For a long time Systematic Theology had made no progress. It was waiting to use the results of the new science of Biblical Theology. From that science much was expected, and much came. But Biblical Theology itself was by and by brought to a standstill. Seeking to discover and to systematize the contents of the Bible, men found that the Bible could not be studied by itself. Its contents could not be isolated from the contents of other religious books. They found that no further progress could be made until the means of comparison with the phenomena of religious life throughout the world was placed at their disposal.

The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics seeks to meet that necessity. It has other and larger aims. The whole range of the religious

teacher's interests is covered by it. The religious and moral life of the world is revealed in it. But the demand of Theology to be considered a progressive science, and to make progress, is never lost sight of. The seventh volume, which has just been published, contains many articles which directly meet the demand.

Among the rest it contains a series of articles on Incarnation. But the mention of Incarnation recalls another reason for the issue of the Encyclopædia. If it has a theological it has also an apologetic value. The opponents of Christianity have for some time been before the world with arguments drawn from the comparative study of Religion. And of all their arguments none has told so disastrously as the assertion that there had been many Christs in the world and that Incarnation was a superstition of almost universal acceptance.

The subject of Incarnation is dealt with in this volume by nine authors and in eleven articles. No facts are obscured. No bias, either for Christianity or against it, can be detected. What was wanted was simply a full and reliable knowledge of the facts, and these men, each of whom is an authority in the religion upon which he writes, have furnished it.

The most important article in the new volume of the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society* (Manchester Univ. Press; 5s. net) has been contributed by Dr. Louis H. Gray, one of the editors of The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, whose subject is 'Zoroastrian and other Ethnic Religious Material in the *Acta Sanctorum*.' But that article is of special interest only to Iranian scholars. In the same number, however, there is a note by Mr. M. A. Canney on a peculiar Hebrew expression, which comes within our province here.

It is the expression 'hip and thigh.' In Jg 15^8 it is said of Samson's slaughter of the Philistines, that 'he smote them hip and thigh.' The meaning, according to the commentators, is that they suffered a complete overthrow. And no doubt the commentators are correct. But why 'hip and thigh'? What is the origin of the phrase? And what appropriateness has it?

No one has been able to answer. Mr. Canney cannot answer. He believes that no answer is possible, for he believes that the phrase is a mistranslation.

Literally translated it is 'leg upon thigh,' which does not make for clearness. Professor G. A. Cooke takes it to mean 'so that the limbs of the slain fall one upon another.' Professor Moore suggests that the phrase is a wrestler's expression, and means 'to trip up.' But none of these meanings commends itself to Mr. Canney.

He believes that the word translated 'leg' (*shōḳ*) is a verb. It does not occur as a verb in Biblical Hebrew, but its equivalent (*sâḳa*) occurs in Arabic. This Arabic verb means 'to drive.' It is used of driving cattle; and it is used of sheep or goats 'pressing' one upon another. This, he believes, might easily pass into 'strike,' and so the meaning of the text would simply be that Samson struck the Philistines upon the thigh. Of course the expression is metaphorical still. The thigh is the seat of life and procreation; and thus the meaning is obtained of ruthless extirpation. Mr. Canney would translate Jg 15^8, 'and he smote them, striking upon the thigh, a great slaughter.'

A discovery of much interest to the student of Religion has been made in Rome. An account of it is given in *The Times* of December 24.

Excavations at the church of San Clemente, begun fifty years ago, but interrupted by the pouring in of water, probably from some ancient aqueduct, were resumed in 1902 and have been

continued until now. Every layer as it was dug up revealed another. First there was the ancient church, erected about the eleventh century. Below its pavement excavation uncovered another and older church, almost perfect in all essential details, and 'filled with matter of the greatest interest to the Christian historian.' Below this church, which cannot be later than the fourth century, there came to light a Roman house of the Imperial period, one chamber of which was evidently regarded as a holy shrine and had been arrayed as an oratory.

There is reason for believing that this is the very house in which St. Clement lived. For tradition says that he belonged to a noble family, possibly the Imperial family of the Flavii; and his father, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, lived in the Coelian region. But this is not the lowest building yet. Below the dwelling-house of St. Clement there has been discovered a mass of masonry which had once been a strong fortress in the days when kings ruled in Rome—'very likely the residence of Tarquin, some five centuries before the birth of Christ.'

Return for a moment to the dwelling-house of St. Clement. For of all that this fertile excavation has revealed, the most important thing is the discovery in this house of two shrines belonging to two rival religions. The one shrine is Mithraic, the other Christian. The shrines are there together, but it is not to be supposed that they were used together. No doubt the Christian shrine was first. Then came Mithras, an intruder into a Christian home,—to be subsequently expelled again, after an unknown number of years, on the triumph of the Catholic Church. The position of these shrines, side by side in a great Roman's home, is testimony of the most impressive kind to the magnitude of the struggle between the religion of Mithras and the religion of Christ which was carried on so long and so doubtfully throughout the Roman Empire.

'Is it the pious duty of every believer in religion to renounce Friedrich Nietzsche and all his works?' The startling question—startling at such a time as this—is asked by Mr. Edwin Dodge HARDIN in the latest number of *The American Journal of Theology*. The title of the article is 'Nietzsche's Service to Christianity.'

Mr. HARDIN is not a follower of Nietzsche. There are followers, and they seem to be on the increase. 'Before his own death Nietzsche had the somewhat uncommon privilege of seeing his doctrines received, rather, seized with avidity, by many, and of being able to foresee in some measure how influential they were destined to become. More than a decade has passed since he died, and his philosophy is still making headway. Some of his characteristic ideas have been welcomed by men of action on both sides of the Atlantic, who find in them a sufficient excuse for themselves, if not an argument strong enough to convince society, for some of their relentless and unscrupulous methods of acquiring and using wealth and power.' But Mr. HARDIN is none of these.

He is a believer in Christ. And he knows very well that no man can be a believer in Christ and in Friedrich Nietzsche. Yet he firmly holds that along with the evil which he has done, Nietzsche has rendered a real service to Christianity. And he gives his reasons.

In the first place Nietzsche has compelled us to see the Christian Faith in its real greatness. 'When in the Roman Church the momentous task is undertaken of adding to the calendar of the saints one who is deemed worthy of the honour, in opposition to those who have been chosen to emphasize the merits of the candidate, a man of large scholarship and critical mind is appointed to the important office of devil's advocate. It is his duty, as his significant title suggests, to bring to light any flaws in the candidate's claim to saint-hood and to throw all possible objections in the way of his canonization. If his efforts prove to be

unavailing, the candidate is eventually crowned as saint with the added lustre that comes from the vindication of his merits against all assaults. Nietzsche may justly be regarded as a sort of devil's advocate in the case of Christianity. Its implacable and uncompromising foe, his very hostility serves the stimulating purpose of compelling Christianity to reveal what merits it possesses and to show such virtues as will stand the most searching and merciless criticism.'

Mr. HARDIN holds that criticism is a good thing. It makes us think, and that in itself is worth much. It forbids us to take things for granted. It compels us to weigh anew moral values which we thought were established for all time. Aeroplanes rise best against the wind; and if Christianity has motive power, it will rise against the wind of criticism, as it once rose against the wind of persecution, to far loftier heights than we are in ordinary times content to have it.

But we may not separate Christianity from Christian men. Nietzsche compels us to look at our own Christian lives. He shakes us with unnecessary roughness at times. But he shakes us. And if it is out of a slumber that is as harmful as it is pleasant he does a service to us. 'Indeed,' asks Mr. HARDIN, 'is he not thereby doing what the prophets of Israel did to arouse a comfortably complacent generation? They did it in their zeal for the Lord of Hosts; he has done it driven by his own remorseless convictions, but both accomplished practically the same end.'

Nietzsche was pitiless. He was always pitiless. But if he was pitiless to others, he was as pitiless to himself. If he saw a certain course to be right, he insisted on others following it, whatever it cost them, and he followed it himself. He followed it himself to its logical conclusion, regardless of the suffering it brought. He broke with Christianity, but he did not do so easily. Mr. HARDIN says he was not the kind of man to cast away the faith of his fathers and of his early years on a mere whim. On premises which were questionable, but which had some show of plausibility, he came to the conclusion that the Christian religion had been a hindrance to real human progress, and therefore he repudiated and denounced it. Mr. HARDIN will not believe that he denounced it out of sheer vanity and wrong-headedness.

He came to believe that there were two standards of morality in the world. One he called 'master-morality'; the other 'slave-morality.' The master-morality is that of the few; it is the morality of the free and independent men in the world who have at all times constituted the minority. The slave-morality is that of the great 'bulk of humanity who are deficient and feeble in body and mind, and whom he regards as the legitimate instruments and even, should the necessity arise, victims of their rightful masters.'

In the lives of the masters, pity and its kindred emotions have no place. For they are not virtues, they are vices. 'They serve no higher end than on the one hand of prolonging the sufferings of the underlings whose existence at best is a poor and inadequate affair and who were better exterminated as summarily as possible, especially if it becomes evident that they can render no more service to their superiors, and on the other hand of prejudicing the judgment and impairing the will of those who yield to them.' Now he could not help observing that the emotion of pity is a great feature in the religion of Christ. In the religion of Christ, therefore, he saw the slave-morality run riot. In the sentiments of pity, humility, patience, brotherhood, reverence, and the like, he found the marks of slaves who emphasized these qualities because they were of most service to themselves in the struggle for existence. To Nietzsche the Sermon on the Mount became anathema.

What service can all this render to Christianity? Directly, says Mr. HARDIN, none at all. Indirectly, a great deal. It compels us to examine ourselves. We are Christians. Are we living out

our Christianity? Are we living it out to the full? What are we doing with the Sermon on the Mount? Mr. HARDIN says that 'One alone thought religion out and lived it out to its logical conclusion, and He died on a cross. May it not be that many of the ills from which society suffers and for which Nietzsche held Christianity in part at least responsible are due less to the fact that Christian principles and morals exist at all than to the fact that they have not been lived enough?'

We believe with all our heart that those virtues which Nietzsche called vices are the very glory of our Faith and the hope of the world. But it is possible enough that by bringing us into the light of his lurid antagonism he has compelled us to see whether we are really ready to have pity on others as God has had pity upon us.

Even in his 'superman,' that peculiar creation of Nietzsche's genius, Mr. HARDIN finds something that may be of service to us. 'Nietzsche draws the picture of a future social condition in which a few strong men, having lived down what he regards as the perverted morality of to-day, shall be the guiding influence of the rest of mankind. Their value to society will have become recognized, and accordingly they will be given places of power and direction. False notions of altruism and of responsibility to their inferiors will have no place in their thoughts. While incidentally and even inevitably conferring benefit upon society by their dominion, which will be wise and strong, they themselves will be the sufficient justification of their ascendency. Untroubled by the religious phantasies and the moral scruples of their inferiors, they will become themselves the creators of new moral values.' These supermen are not gross or self-indulgent. Hard and remorseless towards their inferiors, they are equally hard and remorseless towards themselves. They find the joy of life in the struggle against hardships and in the glad sense of dominion. They rejoice in their strength, they seize with avidity the present moment, and they fall fighting to the last.

This is not Christianity. Mr. HARDIN does not claim that it is. Christianity insists upon an altruism which Nietzsche utterly scorned. But Christianity, like Nietzsche, recognizes the inestimable worth of the individual and sees for him vast and glorious possibilities. 'Christ's message was unquestionably social, but he sought the regeneration of society through the regeneration of the individual. His distinctive teachings were to individuals and not to masses of men, and to individuals he committed the fortunes of the cause to which he devoted his life.'

There is even an element of likeness, and it is an important element, between the superman of Nietzsche and the follower of Christ. 'Nothing could be more unlike and contradictory than on the one hand the dominion of superman founded upon the most inexorable egoism and on the other the kingdom of heaven whose law is love. But in both we see an expectation of better things and a motive for hopeful effort. Christianity believes the best is yet to be, and Nietzsche, travelling by a strange and altogether different road, reaches a similar destination and unconsciously confirms the age-long earnest expectation of humanity which has found its satisfying and perfect fulfilment in the word of Christ.'

And Mr. HARDIN will forgive much to Nietzsche on account of the end. 'Some years before his death his bodily infirmities increased and were accompanied by insanity. The apostle of superman succumbed to the weakness of human flesh, and from his darkened mind was dissipated the consciousness of the will to power. The intrepid philosopher of ruthless independence became helpless and wholly dependent upon the compassion and care of others. And Friedrich Nietzsche, who had despised pity and compassion as infirmities to be suppressed, by an irony of fate lived to see the day when he himself became the object of these peculiarly Christian virtues.

'"Galilean, thou hast conquered!"'

In Praise of Faith.

A STUDY OF HEBREWS XI. 1, 6, XII. 1, 2.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London.

I.

In the account given by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. 11) of the Heroes of Faith, he makes several general statements about his subject which will reward closer scrutiny, as for Christian thought and life faith is of primary importance. The statement in the first verse of the eleventh chapter is not a theological definition of faith, but rather a practical description of what faith attempts and attempting accomplishes. The writer tells us what is faith's *Venture*. Having described the reward of faith in the instances of Abel and Enoch, he gives a reason why faith brings such gain: he estimates its *Value* (v.[6]). After passing in review the succession of faith under the old covenant, he declares that even by the best of these heroes of faith the completion of their endeavour was not attained; as only in Christ has faith its consummation, and only in the life in Him can its goal be reached. Here alone is found the *Verification* of faith (12[1, 2]). At each of these aspects of the subject we may now more closely look.

1. The Revised Version of Hebrews 11[1]: 'Now faith is the assurance (or *gaining*, marg.) of things hoped for, the proving (or *giving substance to*, marg.) of things not seen,' does not make the meaning clear enough. Dr. Moffatt in his *New Translation* makes the sense clearer. 'Now faith means we are confident of what we hope for, convinced of what we do not see.' We may bring out the meaning in a still freer rendering. Faith makes the future as certain as the present, and the invisible as real as the visible; for although it is not here explicitly stated, there is implicitly assumed a contrast between present and future, visible and invisible. About the reality of the visible and the certainty of the present, the common consciousness has no doubt. What the eyes see, or the hands handle, is real, and only a fool could question its reality. The memory of the past may be growing fainter, and the expectation of the future may be very vague, but a man is sure that he has the present moment at least. Common thought and life are dominated by, in bondage to, the visible and the present. Few minds and lives are ruled by the unseen and the future, which in contrast seem unsubstantial. From the ordinary standpoint the man who allows himself to be determined by the invisible and the future is running the risk of winning a doubtful prize at a certain cost. The faith which treats the visible as real and the future as certain is making a venture, which earthly prudence would shrink from and even judge foolhardy. This heroic element in faith is deserving of recognition and emphasis.

2. On the other hand, however, faith is not rash and foolish in its venture, for it is a universal impulse of the soul of man. Man is by his very nature religious, and religion is always and everywhere concerned about these two objects of faith, the invisible and the future; its interest lies in God's existence and man's destiny. The two questions to which it offers, or we might even say risks, an answer are the *Whence* of the world, and the *Whither* of Man. The belief of savage tribes is described by the term *animism*; and this embraces both these objects. Behind the changes and movements of the seen, as their cause, *animism* discerns the unseen spirits, who dwell in, and work through, natural objects; and in man it detects a soul, which survives the body, and continues to exist. To put the matter briefly, the savage believes in gods and ghosts. Very crude are the ideas of gods and ghosts alike; but the belief makes the invisible real, and the future certain, although it may often, unlike Christian faith, bring more fear than joy. It is not necessary now to trace the age-long and world-wide history of human development in which the savage belief has been transformed into the Christian faith; but the Christian faith need not disown its ancient ancestry, its long lineage; for it is in the highest degree impressive and important to observe that always and everywhere man has challenged the dominance of the visible and the present over his

thought and life; and has made the venture of faith which makes the invisible real and the future certain.

3. The description of faith's venture here given is wide enough to embrace savage belief and Christian faith; and we may fill each of the objects to which faith is directed with the distinctively Christian content, even although the writer in the eleventh chapter confines himself to the heroes of faith under the old covenant, while unconsciously in some measure interpreting their faith from the standpoint of the new covenant. The Abraham of history, if indeed the modern critic will allow us to regard his personality as historical, did not 'look for the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God' (v.[10]): it was not a heavenly country (v.[16]) that he and other believers looked for. They trusted and obeyed the invisible God for an earthly, and not a heavenly, future good. It was only in the last stages of the progressive revelation in the chosen people that faith looked beyond the earthly to the heavenly good; and the saints of God desired and expected a continuance of their fellowship with God in an eternal life beyond death. Even the Messianic hope, until transformed in the Jewish apocalypses, pointed to a kingdom of God on earth. This difference we must recognize, and yet maintain the essential identity of the Christian faith with that of Hebrew saints as making the invisible real and the future certain.

4. We may now limit our regard to Christian faith, and inquire what the invisible for it is, and how it is made real. While Christian faith holds that there is a spiritual world, in which dwell the possessors of the immortality, and we shall afterwards try, as it were, to catch a glimpse of their glory, yet its primary object is God Himself, the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and our Father in Him, the risen, living, and reigning Christ Himself, present with and active for His people, and the Holy Spirit of God dwelling and working in the inmost life of the believer himself. It may be that few Christians do realize the Godhead in fulness of being and blessing. To many Christ alone has vivid reality; and their conception of Father and Spirit is vague. But when the believer thinks out what Christ is and does, he finds both Father and Spirit inseparably one with Christ. Above and beyond, yet also in and through the visible world of nature and humanity, faith finds the reality of this invisible God; truth, holiness, love, grace in all, through all, and over all. In this world of time and sense he may ever be attended by this vision splendid of the Eternal God, made known and giving Himself to man as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. No conception of the divine which has been reached by any other religion can compare for a moment in value for mind and soul with this reality for Christian faith, for it alone satisfies the heart's deepest needs.

5. This invisible is as real as the visible for Christian faith, because in Christ the visible and invisible are linked together, the invisible became visible, and the visible has become invisible. 'No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him' (Jn 1[18]). 'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth' (v.[14]). The eternal Son, the incarnate Word Himself, claimed: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (14[9]). The Christian apostle confessed Him 'the image of the invisible God' (Col 1[15]), and declared that 'in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' (2[9]). The writer of the words we are now considering describes the Son as 'the effulgence of God's glory, and the very image of his substance' (1[3]). As the human personality which is invisible reveals itself in look, smile, gesture, word, to the sense of eye or ear, so the historical reality of Jesus is the perceptible manifestation of God. The revelation was rational, moral, spiritual; and it is a misunderstanding of the New Testament teaching to lay stress on the *flesh* as physical organism in the evangelist's description of the incarnation as a defence of sacramentarianism; but the inner life expressed and communicated itself through the outward signs of word and deed; and so the truth and grace of God showed their reality in the world of sense.

6. If it be objected that that reality was confined to a few years and a small country, and thus the invisible has not for us become visible, the reply lies at hand. How much we accept as real within this sensible world, which is for us past in time and distant in space, on the testimony of those who have seen and heard! How little knowledge of reality we should have if it were confined to what our eyes see, or hands handle!

It is incredible that the record of this life could have been imagined or invented; a portrait of perfection could not have been produced by sinful men unless they were copying from reality. If it be urged further that testimony does deceive, may we not plead that there is an inner witness which confirms the outer testimony.

Reason, conscience, and spirit in man set their seal to the truth of this revelation of God. If man has any sense of values in the realm of the spirit, he cannot but appreciate the absolute value of the revelation of God in Christ. Both by reliance on human testimony, which by its quality justifies our confidence, and with the confirmation of the soul's ideals and aspirations, we who have not seen can believe, and even have the fuller blessing of believing without sight. Jesus, and God in Him, may become real to us, and faith gain certainty.

7. For Christian faith the reality of Christ, however, is not confined to the earthly life, of which there is preserved a trustworthy record; the visible has again become invisible, but has not on that account lost its reality for the believer. For Paul, who had only a glimpse of the Lord of Glory, He was a constant companion. Christ lived in him, and to him to live was Christ. And not for him only, but for the Christian faith as represented in the New Testament, Christ remained the constant universal presence, and the supreme saving power. Not to dwell on instances of previous generations, but to take only one example from our own age, for Dr. Dale Christian life was *the fellowship of the living Christ.* To him the invisible Lord was real, present, active. The reality of Christ for Christian experience may be verified even for the world by Christian character.

He may be again brought within the range of the sensible world in the words and works of those whose life is hid with Him in God. As faith claims His grace, the character is so transformed that the old things pass away, and so conformed to Christ Himself that all things become new; the believer reproduces Him in perceptible manifestation. In this experience of fellowship with the living Christ, and consequent change into His likeness, the presence and power of the Spirit of God Himself is realized, and in the fruits of the Spirit there is an outer witness of this inner reality. God in Christ by His Spirit is real, present, active in Christian experience and character; but the constant and necessary condition of this manifestation of God is human faith, apprehending, appreciating, and appropriating divine truth and grace. Faith does not make the invisible reality; but it becomes real for thought and life only through faith.

8. As this relation to God in Christ is to an eternal reality, the life of man in God is an eternal life. Accordingly the reality of the invisible carries with it the certainty of the future for Christian faith. Union with Christ as Saviour and Lord is the condition and the assurance of a perfect, blessed, and glorious immortality. 'Because *he* lives, *we* shall live also' (Jn 14^{19}). In His Resurrection He is 'the firstfruits of them that are asleep' (1 Co 15^{20}), 'the firstborn among many brethren' (Ro 8^{29}). 'As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly' (1 Co 15^{49}). 'It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is' (1 Jn 3^{2}). 'We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{18}). The present conformation of the Christian character to Christ is the promise and pledge of the future glorification of the Christian personality in the clearer vision and closer communion of the heavenly life. It is true that this hope of the Apostolic Age was connected with the expectation of the Second Advent and the general Resurrection; but it need not lose its substance, even if it change its form. Even Paul had to recognize that he might die before the expectation he cherished was realized; but faith did not on that account lose its certainty of the future. He was 'of good courage, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord' (2 Co 5^{8}). Because death was a home-going to the Christ who had been his life, death was gain to him (Phil 1^{21}). Christian faith to-day has the warrant of the faith of the New Testament in using of Christ the words of the 23rd Psalm (v.[4]), even if the reference in the historical interpretation of the words is to deliverance from earthly peril. 'Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me: thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me.' Not on some remote future is this Christian hope fixed; but it can triumph even in the hour and the article of death. The Valley of the Shadow becomes radiant with

the glory of the presence of the Conqueror of death; and the unseen world is no longer a dreaded mystery, but the many mansions of the Father's house, to which, as a place prepared by His love for them, He receives all who live in Him, so that where He is and as He is, they too shall be. It is His saving and blessed will that all who are given to Him may be with Him, to behold the glory given Him by the Father (Jn 17^{24}). Christian faith can meet the challenge of the mystery of death, the agony of the separation of the loved and loving, and the tragedy of the silence of the departed by an unshaken and unshakable assurance that all who are Christ's live eternally in Him, whether on earth or in heaven.

9. When the world is all sunshine without cloud or storm, when life is a bright and an easy path, when love is undisturbed in its joy, faith may be lightly held and easily won; but when faith is most needed, when the world is dark and drear, life hard and bitter, and love is smitten by bereavement, then faith often becomes very difficult, appears even impossible. And yet it is then that faith can prove its worth, by relieving the gloom, lightening the burden, and bringing comfort and companionship in the loneliness. The soul's extremity has often been faith's opportunity.

Men have fallen back on God and immortality when no other refuge remained to the soul. To believe that this seemingly unintelligible world has a meaning, and that that meaning is love, the divine Fatherhood in all, through all, and over all; to believe that through the shadows of death gleams the glory of the eternal life in God, is a possession worth gaining, even if hard to win. Man cannot achieve this victory of faith for himself in the darkness and despair of his soul. But then Christ meets him with the victory which He achieved over the world, sin, sorrow, and death, through His faith in the invisible and the future, God the Father, and the eternal life in God; and, inspired by His faith, man, too, can exercise faith, and become a sharer of His victory, even more than a conqueror through Him that loved him with a love which endured the uttermost of sacrifice to save to the uttermost.

In the Study.

Books for the Pulpit.

Professor James Stalker has done a thing which, to our certain knowledge, several men have had the hope of doing, and he has done it admirably. He has shown how Psychology may be used with effect in the pulpit. It was his deliberate purpose to show this. He wished to provide 'a welcome change to hearers rather tired of the rope thrown to a drowning man or the rescue by a fireman from a burning house.' In Kirkcaldy, he tells us, and in Glasgow he taught psychology in its religious aspects to a Bible class, 'and no other subject I ever tried either drew so large a class or kept it so well together to the end of the session.' Pursuing the subject, he delivered lectures at Richmond and Auburn Seminaries in the United States of America. These lectures are now republished in the volume entitled *Christian Psychology* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.).

Dr. Stalker's success will encourage other men. We believe that in this direction it is possible to move with excellent results; but it is a course dotted with pitfalls, and only the most wary and best equipped will avoid them. Dr. Stalker is both well equipped and wary. He has left much psychology alone; he has used as much as could be relied upon and made intelligible. His success in turning to new uses old and discarded weapons of interest, such as dreams, habits, the heart, the memory, is his reward.

Dr. Paterson-Smyth has published a volume of sermons containing 'some lessons of the present crisis.' The title is *God and the War* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). Four of them form a series; and in them he has the Christian courage to deal with the life beyond in direct reference to the men who have died in battle. His courage is the greater because he holds that 'in a very real sense this life may be the sole probation time for man.'

War and Christianity is one of the volumes of sermons which the present time has brought into

being (Jarrold; 6d. net). It is a small volume in paper covers, but it contains sane sermons by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Knaresborough, and seven other Churchmen.

The Reproach of War (Scott; 1s. 6d. net) is the title of yet another volume of sermons on the present strife. It is a remarkable book. On every page the reality of war is brought home to us. Yet that reality, awful as it is, never merely disgusts us. No sermon is preached without the thought of sacrifice in its purifying power being made as real as is the hour of carnage. Canon F. B. Macnutt has *felt*; and the feeling has made the Cross more to him and sent him to make it more than ever it has been to us.

The 'Remembers' of the Book of Deuteronomy caught the attention of Professor Denney a good many years ago, and he wrote a memorable sermon on them. They have now caught the attention of the Rev. J. A. Hutton, M.A., and he has written five sermons on them. He has published the five sermons in a beautiful book called *The Way of Remembrance* (James Clarke & Co.; 1s. net).

Under the title of *In a Preacher's Study* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.), Professor George Jackson, B.A., has published a gathering of essays on living topics, all remarkable for the frankness of speech and forward view of their accomplished author. There are not a few who watch for Mr. Jackson's writing as they watch for the morning, and to them the book will be almost all familiar. But they, beyond all others, will hasten to buy it. For while Mr. Jackson deals always with the things of the passing hour, his work never passes with the hour. Even on so well-worn a topic as 'The Problem of Demoniacal Possession in the Gospels,' he writes an essay which will continue to be referred to by expositors for a long time.

A Theologian's Workshop, Tools and Methods.—Under that title the Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, D.D., issues the last volume, as he says, 'of a programme formed fifty years ago' (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). What that programme was he tells us in a most interesting preface to this volume. He had become a believer in exegesis and exposition; he resolved to give his life to show what accurate exegesis and believing exposition could do for the New Testament, and to that determination he has been faithful as to a trust committed to him. The present volume is an excellent example of his work. It will be one of the most popular of his books, for it has scholarship as much as any of them, and it has more variety and lightness of touch.

In *The Book of Answered Prayer* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.) the Rev. John T. Faris, D.D., has told some stories to show that God is the hearer and answerer of prayer. The answers are all immediate and arresting. Of course other explanations are possible. Other explanations are possible of everything that happens. The events here recorded are to Dr. Faris most easily and most naturally explained as direct supernatural answers to prayer. Why did he not give his authorities more fully? He condenses, for example, Dr. Hudson Taylor's well-known account of the springing up of the wind as he was journeying in China, and does not improve it. The exact quotation from Dr. Hudson Taylor's book with exact reference to it would have been better. The persuasiveness of such narratives as these often depends upon our belief in the narrator.

The Bishop of Edinburgh has published a volume of sermons for the comforting of those whom the war has made desolate. He calls it *The Gospel of Hope* (Scott; 2s. net). The chief comfort that he offers is to encourage mourners to believe that they may hold intercourse with their dead. He does not mean by spiritualism; he means by thought. He says that the presence of the departed may be realized by simply but deliberately thinking of them. There is another way—by praying for them. In the last sermon Dr. Walpole encourages prayer for the dead and gives examples of prayer to be used.

The day of the 'Lecture' is coming again. But it will depend upon the lectures. If preachers can preach 'lectures' like those which the Rev. H. Maynard Smith has published in his volume on *The Epistle of S. James* (Blackwell; 6s. net), the 'Lecture' will be found as interesting as it is instructive. For instruction there is no comparison between it and the ordinary sermon on a haphazard text. To go through a book of the Bible, almost any book, systematically, is instructive enough to

make character, if only the interest is retained. Mr. Maynard Smith retains it by being himself always interested, always in touch with the latest scholarship, and always sincere. There is no attempt at originality and no desire for it. St. James himself is original enough. It is our business to make him speak to our own generation.

Heroic Leaders (Partridge; 2s. net) is the title which the Rev. Dinsdale T. Young has given to a volume of addresses delivered to young men and women on some of the 'Great Saints of British Christianity.' The saints are Ken, Goodwin, Leighton, Philip and Matthew Henry, Baxter, Newton, Simeon, Keble, and Chalmers. It is a mine not worked at all as it ought to be. We do well to lecture on the Saints of the Old and New Testaments. We should do well to turn sometimes to the saints of Christian history, and *especially* of our own Christian history. Mr. Young gives us courage as well as example.

The Rev. Charles Jerdan, B.A., D.D., has just published his sixth volume of sermons to children, and every volume of the six is a large volume. This one contains sixty-one addresses, all of good full measure. No doubt Dr. Jerdan has the way of it. Other preachers admit his excellence and buy his books. But we hope they are given as gifts to the little ones. They are as interesting (for they are filled with well-told anecdotes) as any story of impossible adventure, and very much more wholesome. The title of this volume is *Seed-Corn and Bread* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net).

The Rev. John Keddie Graham, M.A., can speak to young men. A strikingly original volume of addresses, evidently delivered to audiences of growing manhood, has been published by him with the title of *Anno Domini* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 2s. 6d. net). The topic of the first address is January. It is called 'The Month of Opportunity.' The text is, 'Behold, I have set before thee an open door' (Rev 3^{8}). Forcible, memorable, uplifting things are said about the opportunities of life, all with a sense of variety and individuality. February is the Month of Purification. And so on. Some of the months are grouped, so that there are just seven addresses in all.

The Rev. David Jenks, Director of the Society of the Sacred Mission, has, under the title of *In the Face of Jesus Christ*, published a course of Meditations for the Christian Year (Longmans; 6s. net). The pages of the book have passed through the crucible of experience. Ten years ago Mr. Jenks began the practice of supplying week by week the outline of a meditation for the use of students in the House of the Sacred Mission. The slips used for that purpose are now collected and issued in this volume. There is a page and a meditation for every day of the Christian year. The text is chosen, the picture is suggested, the resolve is made, and then the words are meditated upon under three 'heads.' Take the Friday after Ash-Wednesday. The text is 'Mortify therefore' (Col 3^{5}). The Picture is 'a non-Christian oriental ascetic.' The Resolve is 'a mortification of the will this Lent.' The three heads are: (1) 'Mortification'; (2) 'Christian Mortification'; and (3) 'Mortify therefore.' Each 'head' is subdivided into three parts. Of the last 'head' this is the last part: 'The *therefore* contains the Christian attitude towards this problem and reveals a mortification which is the way of peace and joy by the setting free from the slavery of self for the fellowship of Christ. It speaks of a will strengthened by him, and of a present reward of his life growing within. The Christian does not live for the future; he realizes a present.'

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

An Old Valentine.

'Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.'—Mk 13^{31}.

Long ago, boys and girls, and sometimes even grown-up people, used to count the fourteenth day of February as a special day in the year. They looked for the postman in the morning, because they expected their best friends to send them valentines.

Your impression of a valentine may be but that of a cheap, vulgar picture. But some of us have a faint recollection of the time when a valentine, instead of being vulgar, often conveyed a beautiful message. The custom of sending valentines is a very old one. It began in superstition, as early as the fifteenth century. A company of people gathered

together on the fourteenth of February, the day on which the birds were supposed to find their mates, and the names of a select number of one sex were, by an equal number of the other, put into some vessel; after that every one drew a name, which for the time being they called their valentine; and they looked upon the drawing of that name as an omen that one day they would love each other. Later, valentines became a medium simply to convey thoughts of love; and it is about a valentine of this kind that I want to speak.

I found it at the breaking up of a family house: it lay at the bottom of an old workbox. Though faded with age, it must have one day been a dainty thing. Round the edge, the paper was embossed, so that it looked like fine lace. I cannot say that the picture adorning it attracted me much; but the words, written in very delicate and old-fashioned penmanship, did:

> This little tribute which I send,
> I hope you will receive;
> And keep it for the sake of one
> Who never will deceive.

They seemed to bring a resurrection of lives that had been lived long ago. The little valentine itself was apparently a treasure. One person had loved another very much; perhaps they had loved each other. They had at least been friends.

Had their friendship gone for nothing? In Asia Minor, hundreds of years before Jesus Christ was born, there was a poet called Heraclitus. In our English literature there are some beautiful verses, supposed to be a friend's farewell to his friend—this same poet Heraclitus.

> They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead,
> They brought me bitter news to hear, and bitter tears to shed.
> I wept as I remembered how often you and I
> Had tired the sun with talking, and sent him down the sky.
>
> And now that thou art lying, my dear old Carian guest,
> A handful of grey ashes, long, long ago at rest,
> Still are thy pleasant voices, thy nightingales, awake;
> For Death he taketh all away, but them he cannot take.

Death 'taketh all away.' Even your boy and girl friends who love you sometimes die; but Death cannot take memory away, he cannot take love.

'A friend who never will deceive.' Unfortunately there are people in this world who go by the name of 'friend,' and who do 'deceive.' You have met them already, I know, and after being in their company, you went home with all the evil that was in your heart stirred up. You were ready to hate; you were ready to quarrel. To have made friends with a deceiver is a cruel experience, I know.

But, my boys and girls, Jesus knew what true love meant; He knew about the keeping of promises; He knew about you and me; and He left us this wonderful promise: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' When He spoke them, I believe His audience would scarcely grasp their meaning. They were just obscure, commonplace men. Jesus Himself was known as a working man. He was not learned in the ordinary sense of the term. Yet He said, 'My words shall not pass.' Think what that means, my boys and girls. The hills that we call 'everlasting' shall pass away, and our friends die, but the things that Jesus has said about Life and Death shall remain for ever and ever. There were great philosophers lived before He came to earth. They had the best education that Greece and Rome could give; but where is their influence now? As a power to make people live better lives, it is gone.

The story of the religion of Jesus Christ reads like the story of a wonderful miracle. His words have helped the very best people in the world for nineteen hundred years. And they were written for you. You have them in your Testament. They are about things that abide for ever; they are about Love and Eternal Life. Let each boy and girl think of the New Testament as being the gift of some one who loves them, and who has said that His is a love that will never change. As I repeat this old, old truth once again — in all reverence I quote the words of the faded valentine:

> This little tribute which I send,
> I hope you will receive,
> And keep it for the sake of One
> Who never will deceive.

II.

The Sting of being Deceived.

By the Rev. Frank Cox.

If it is difficult to preach to children, it is more difficult to preach to young men and women. There are not many things that young men and women

dislike more than preaching. For there is a time, the time when men and women are young, when preaching is always interpreted as preaching at. But so it must be. What is the use of preaching that is not preaching at? What is the use of preaching that irritates no one's conscience? And whenever our conscience is irritated, we think the preacher is preaching at us. Then there is another difficulty. The young man or young woman is predominantly intellectual, and rejects preaching that remembers the emotions. But purely intellectual preaching is 'barren as a vestal virgin,' to use Bacon's simile. How are these difficulties to be overcome? The Rev. Frank Cox has endeavoured to overcome them in his volume of addresses to young men and women called *In Life's Golden Time* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). Has he overcome them? You may judge by this fair example of his addresses.

Few things in life are more painful than the sting of being deceived. Young people who find themselves victims of falsehood and hypocrisy are often greatly discouraged.

It is as natural for youth to believe in human nature as it is to rejoice in the wonders of Creation. There is in every life, at the beginning, an openness and candour, a guileless simplicity and unsuspecting trust, which responds with admiration and affection wherever there is a strong appeal. This is one of the most delightful features and precious possessions of early life. It was greatly appreciated by our Lord, and should be regarded as unspeakably sacred by all those who call it forth. Those who trifle with it, who blight its beauty with the breath of falsehood, and quench its joy with heartless hypocrisy, are guilty of a sin for which Christ Himself has pronounced the judgment: 'It is profitable for him that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depth of the sea.' There is no more dastardly or inexcusable sin than ruthlessly to betray the trust of a little child, to abuse the confidence of youth, or to trifle with the affections of early manhood and womanhood. 'Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling! for it must needs be that the occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh!'

tion. And in many lives, before any great age grouped, so his youthful simplicity is rudely shaken, in all. ved. It does not always happen in the same way, nor is it equally serious in every case. For some this 'sting' is like the deadly fang of the viper and the cobra, moral death following swiftly in its track. With others it more nearly resembles a few hours' pain from the sting of a wasp, or even the lesser discomfort from the bite of a gnat, while some natures seem to be almost immune from such irritations. Nevertheless, whether the suffering be much or little, the sting is never pleasant, and in many cases the after-effects are very serious.

Unfortunate results frequently follow when young people are deceived in some prominent church officer, or leader in Christian work. In the church they attended as children there was one to whom all others looked up, who was foremost in all the church's activity, who gave generously to all the church's funds, and could pray with wonderful feeling and power. Young people delighted in his honeyed words and winning smile, and for all his goodness gave him freely of their admiration and love. Then one day, like a peal of thunder out of a peaceful summer sky, came the report that this man was missing. Soon it was discovered he had been misappropriating other people's money, and cunningly misleading those who trusted him, until he was exposed as an unscrupulous liar and rogue. The human idol was shattered before the bewildered eyes of those who had paid him homage, while the effect on their faith and moral purpose was disastrous. They were utterly discouraged in the best aims of life, and, giving themselves up to cynicism and flippancy, were soon indulging in the cheap sneer of the world, 'If that is Christianity, we want none of it!'

Others first taste the bitterness of deception through the falsity of some one who has been trusted as a personal friend. The beginning of the friendship was very remarkable; it had all the appearance of God's ordering, and for a time was a great joy. Apparently every interest and hope of life was shared, to mutual advantage. Then one day the deceiver said he was in trouble; said it in such a confiding way that the other readily promised all possible help. Or, it may be, he came with the air of one who has made a great discovery, and, as a proof of his high appreciation of the friendship, offered to let the other into his secret. Then came the proposal for a joint venture and a sharing of profits. The story told was so plausible that he soon gained all he wished. What followed is a sorry tale. The venture failed, the money was

lost, and even the good name of the other was besmirched. For the deceiver, not content with lying and thieving, did not hesitate to shield himself under the public disgrace of his victim. Such deception is most discouraging.

And what shall I say of that deception which is painful beyond all others, when holy love is blighted by a false lover? There are friends *and* friends. Some remain on the outskirts of life, delightful companions with whom we work and play; but they never cross love's threshold to dwell in the home of the heart. When love comes knocking at the door, and is admitted, then friendship passes into something far more sacred and sublime. Should that chosen one, who came in the name and guise of love, who was admitted to the heart's most sacred places and received its choicest gifts, turn out to be a traitor bent only on theft, or a mere adventurer who did not care what ruin he wrought, then the sting of being deceived becomes an agony for which there are no words. Such suffering may drive the soul back upon God and work out some larger good, or it may pass into sullenness and end in despair; but the marks of such grief are seldom lost, and life must be for ever changed by such an experience.

These are some of the ways in which young people know the sting of being deceived, and such experiences have done more to turn them from the Church and to shake their faith in Christianity than all the higher critics of the Bible on the one hand, or anti-Christian books on the other. At such hours it is not iron which enters the blood, but poison. The strong revulsion of feeling has driven many a young man to 'angrily blow out his light.'

The one sure way of finding comfort and strength in such an hour is to turn once more to the teaching and companionship of Christ. When this is done one or two exceedingly helpful things are at once apparent.

In the first place, it means much to any discouraged one to find that Christ Himself shared this experience. He knows all about it, not only because He is 'God all-knowing,' but because in the days of His flesh He, too, was deceived. He suffered much through the weakness and falsity of human nature. His brethren in His own family, who through many years saw all the 'sweetness and light' of His radiant character, did not believe in Him. The religious leaders of the day, who ought to have been his best helpers, turned out His worst opponents. Of His specially chosen disciples one denied Him with oaths and curses, another sold Him for silver, while all of them misunderstood Him through the mouths of their following and forsook Him in the end. Listen to His cry of pain as He saw what was in the heart of Judas even in the upper room: 'When Jesus had said this he was troubled in spirit, and testified, saying, Verily, verily, I say unto you, one of you shall betray me!' A careful study of those words reveals the fact that the treachery of Judas pained our Lord more than anything else during His earthly life. Yes, He knew it all; the shock of disappointment, the sense of loneliness and desolation, the wound that bleeds in secret—these all came to Him as they come to us, and we are assured of perfect sympathy when we tell Him of this 'sting' and its discouragement.

But sympathy alone is not enough. We need guidance and strength. We cannot stand still, and everything depends on taking the right step. Something must be done, and the right thing may prove exceedingly difficult. We need the inspiration of some great example and the help of one who is strong. It is in these respects that Christ in His greatness and sufficiency meets all our needs. To company with Him is to hear, at every point, a wonderful gospel of forgiveness. He declares we must not cherish resentment, however basely we have been betrayed; that we must forgive others, even as we hope to be forgiven by God. 'After this manner pray ye. . . . Our Father . . . forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' 'How often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven.' 'Thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou besoughtest me: shouldest not thou also have had mercy on thy fellow-servant, even as I had mercy on thee?' 'But love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High, for he is kind toward the unthankful and evil.' What a gospel for a world where there is so much deception and wrong! If any should say it is impossible, let him note how consistently the Master lived it out. He never cut Himself off from those who wronged Him, never allowed His disposition to become morose and

uncharitable, never gave way to sullenness, never cherished revenge, never became unapproachable and hard. Through it all He remained tender and gracious, still believed in man, still offered His love, and those who turned to Him again found a ready and full forgiveness. So did He translate His own gospel into 'loveliness of perfect deeds,' and at the last laid down His life for those who had mocked His kindness with cruelty and returned His love with hate.

These are the things we need to remember when we are smarting under 'the sting of being deceived.' To keep our thoughts brooding on our own injury will only deepen depression and render us more impotent. To turn our thoughts Christward, listening to His great words of love, watching His perfect example, getting close to His heart in which malice never found a home—that is to be quieted, and healed, and made strong again.

In George Eliot's great book, *Romola*, there is a scene in which Romola, overcome with sorrow and despair, has fled from her home and Florence. The man she had married proved utterly unworthy of her love; every hope had been dashed, and she could endure no more. Outside the city gates she met Savonarola, who recognized her, and spoke with the tender faithfulness and irresistible authority of a noble nature. As the trembling woman listened, her bitterness abated, her purpose changed, and her heart was braced for new effort. 'While Savonarola spoke, Romola felt herself surrounded and possessed by the glow of his passionate faith. The chill doubts all melted away; she was subdued by the sense of something unspeakably great to which she was being called by a strong being who roused in her a new strength.' Yielding to that gracious influence, she retraced her steps to face the old problems with new courage and hope. With infinitely greater tenderness, with more radiant purity, with mightier authority and uplifting power, does Christ meet us in the hours when we have been deceived and would fain run away from it all. Just to be near Him, to feel the touch of His hand, to listen as He tells us the way we should take, to set our weary feet in His footprints, to open our hearts to His infinite love, is to be calmed, to be restored, to be made noble enough to forgive and strong enough to start again.

From this healing and cleansing of the heart two things at least would follow which mean very much in the days of youth. There would be a new delight in public worship, in family prayer, and in private devotion. No one can find real gladness or liberty in these if unkind feelings are cherished towards others. I have heard young people give this as the reason why they found the services of the sanctuary tedious, or why they kept away altogether. 'How can I worship when I feel like this? How can I go to that church when the person who wronged me sits not far away? How can I pretend to read my Bible and pray while all the time I am full of bitter resentment?' Such questions are perfectly reasonable, for no one can worship with profit, in public or in private, while the heart is full of malice and the mind is planning revenge. When R. L. Stevenson lived in Samoa he had family prayers in his house, which was open for the natives also, who usually attended in considerable numbers. One night the chief, who had come in for the little service, suddenly left the room. A friend, fearing illness, went after him and asked what it was. 'It is this,' was the reply; 'I am not yet fit to say, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us."' He had just heard of the treacherous conduct of one in whom he had every reason to trust, and while his heart was full of resentment he could not praise or pray. To those who forgive, who put away all bitterness and wrath, who keep the heart open to love as they pray for more love, God's house will become a new place, the Bible a new Book, and worship a new joy.

More important still, if this course is taken the one who did the wrong may be greatly helped. It is easy to denounce such a person as heartless and cruel; but it may be there is something else to be said. Though he may not show any sign of repentance nor offer any apology, he may have hours of depression and grief because of what he has done. Or perhaps he is in danger of becoming reckless, feeling that it does not matter now. Since those who were once his friends have denounced him as a contemptible cad or a cruel fiend, why should he care about what happens? There may be times when he would give anything to know you had forgiven, or when your forgiveness, if made plain to him, would save him from further and reckless sin. Your forgiving love may start him on the upward way, while your continued bitterness and manifested contempt may have the very opposite effect. Peter denied his Lord with oaths and curses, but no sooner had he done it

than he would have torn his tongue out for the awful words he had spoken. What would his Master think of him? If only he could get near Him and ask His pardon! But, look, He is being taken away! They will crucify Him, and Peter's opportunity will be gone for ever! Oh, if he could but let Him know how grieved he was for that base denial! Already they had led Him away, and Peter could only rush out into the night and weep the bitter tears of a broken-hearted man. Yet before he went 'the Lord turned and looked on Peter.' That look was a token of love which Peter would cherish for ever. But it could not end there. The Master would never leave a contrite disciple in doubt as to his being forgiven and restored. So on the morning of the resurrection Peter is specially mentioned, and later in the day there was a private interview between the forgiving Lord and the forgiven denier! How like the Lord to do that! May it not be that some of us should go and do likewise? If not by personal interview, then by kindly letter or unmistakable act, we should let the forgiven one know that the matter is ended for ever. It might, and in all probability would, lift an intolerable load from that heart, and be the beginning of better days for that life.

Do you say you cannot? Ah! wait a moment. Have you really asked for and accepted *His* forgiveness of *you*? It is the joy of His forgiveness of all our base denial of Him that makes it easy to forgive others. When our hearts are filled with His peace, we cannot keep back from anything that would bring another into the same blessed experience. For His sake we can do what of ourselves we should think preposterous.

Breathe on me, breath of God,
Fill me with life anew!
That I may love what Thou dost love,
And do what Thou wouldst do!

III.

The Unsung Magnificat.

By the Rev. Herbert S. Seekings, Harrogate.

'Making melody *with your heart* to the Lord.'—Eph 5^{19}.

I suppose most young people know the chant called *Magnificat*. It is one of that group of hymns which St. Luke has collected for us in the opening chapters of his Gospel. They are all about the birth of Jesus, and this one was sung by His mother, the Virgin Mary. It is a Bible hymn, and we often sing it during evening service in the church. Now it is about this hymn that I want to tell you this story:—

Once in an ancient monastery in the Fen country the monks met together, contrary to their usual custom, after evening worship, and a shadow rested upon the face of each. It was a shadow which came from within and told of trouble. For a while no one spoke. It seemed to them that silence was most fitting.

At last Ambrose, the oldest and most honoured of them all, began to speak. 'Brothers!' he said, 'it hath been ordained of God that praise should be rendered Him in the church. But the damp air of the Fens has taken the music from our voices and we cannot sing. Did you not notice the grief of the Abbot this very night when we tried to sing the chant which the Holy Mother gave to the Church of her Blessed Son? The music is in our hearts, but it is like a bird with broken wings; it cannot soar. I will not distress you with my words, for you all feel even as I do. Let us away to the Abbot and tell him our sorrow!' To this the brothers assented, and soon Ambrose was pouring their lament into his ears.

'My sons!' said the Abbot, when Ambrose had finished, 'you have done well in coming thus to me. There is but one remedy. We must persuade someone to join our Order to whom God has given the gift of song. Some time ago I spent a night in the monastery among the hills, and there I heard the singing of Brother Thomas. Could he but be transferred to us, or could he come but for one night to sing the *Magnificat*, all might be well. I will put the case to his Superior.'

So it was arranged that on Christmas eve Brother Thomas should come to sing the hymn of the Virgin Mother. And when the night came when the bells voice the message of goodwill to men, the young monk rose and sang the beautiful words as they had never been sung before within those walls. There was no envy in the hearts of the other monks, for they were all good men whose great desire in worship was to please God. Each went contentedly to his cell with a great joy in his heart. The *Magnificat* had been sung that night as it should be sung!

Now it happened that night that a wonderful thing occurred in that old monastery. The Abbot beheld a vision. The Cross at the foot of his

couch became dazzlingly bright, and through the brightness an angel's face appeared. Presently the angel spoke.

'Brother,' he said, 'the God we both adore
Hath sent me down to ask, Is not all right?
Why was *Magnificat* not sung to-night?'

Not sung! Why, it had been sung splendidly! And the Abbot told the story of the monks who could not sing, and also of the coming of Brother Thomas. Then the angel said that every night the singing of the harsh-voiced monks had been heard in heaven, but that on this night no song had been heard. And he told the reason why it had not been heard. The young monk did not sing to praise God and to please Him. He sang to please others and to get praise for himself. And so when he sang he sang, and that was all. He did not worship. And because he did not worship his song never got higher than the roof. It was not heard in heaven.

Then the angel said a really beautiful thing, and for the sake of this I have told you the story. It is a thing I want you to remember every time you sing any hymn in the church. Said he:

'From purest hearts most perfect music comes.'

Do you understand what he meant? He meant that singing in worship is not simply a matter of the voice. It is a matter of the heart. How happy ever after that were those rough-voiced monks in the old Fen monastery. Their hearts were pure, and God heard the music of their hearts. But if the heart is vain, Heaven never hears the melody. So says the legend of THE UNSUNG MAGNIFICAT.

IV.

The Reporting Angel.

BY THE REV. A. C. HILL.

Mr. A. C. Hill gets round the difficulties of preaching to young men and women by writing essays for them. He is wise. It is one of the peculiarities of young men and sometimes of young women that they will go out of their way to read a sermon in the form of an essay. Of course the essay is not necessarily religious. But Mr. Hill is well aware that a merely moral essay is as fruitless and as feckless as a merely moral discourse. So he insinuates his religion effectively. Take an example. Take the shortest in his book entitled *The Sword of the Lord* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

When John Lamb knocked Hazlitt down for some offensive remark, the essayist, as he ruefully dusted his coat, could say that he did not mind a blow. Being a metaphysician, only an idea could hurt him. It is a fortunate constitution and the possessor of it might count himself happy, though there have been metaphysicians who failed to reach that grade of intellectual absorption. But it shows that there are persons who can be acutely pained even by such an impalpable thing as an idea. To Caliban, cringing and spitting alternately in the presence of his master, it may seem absurd that a creature capable of eating and drinking should be distressed about the truth or falsehood of a thought, and the Calibans of the world are not few in number. But there have been many men to whom Pilate's question gave the keenest pleasure and the sharpest pain they ever knew, and they are certainly amongst the saving forces of the world.

Can we trust the reason of man? Is there anything substantial and real corresponding to our mental judgments, or have men always been cheated by appearances, clutching at golden apples only to find them turn to dust in their grasp? One answer to this is at least pertinent. On the belief in the trustworthiness of the human faculties men have built the fabric of organized knowledge. The assumptions on which that mass of information has been reared may be questioned; there is a scepticism which goes below all recorded facts and sees even the Babel tower of science as no more than a winter palace doomed to melt beneath the sun, but indisputably many of the results have been good. The ideas have proved themselves workable in actual life, and man has found that by trusting to his faculties, experimenting under their direction, he has been able to create a world which ministers ever more effectively to his necessities.

The value of this world, created, or rather brought out of darkness, by the ingenuity of man, is pretty well appreciated. Swift could declare that the only persons he knew who were glad of the end of the world were a man going to be hanged and another who was to be cut for the stone, and there is an immense consensus of opinion that the net result of human ingenuity and

industry is worth while, that life offers to most men something of value.

And in that world of moral truth which is the peculiar home of man, the judgments of the deciding agency have also been substantiated by the facts of life. The peoples who have lived in accord with the higher impulses of their nature have held for the longest period the rulership of the world. To that extent we discover a conformity between moral perceptions and universal reality. Nations that have cultivated manly virtues, that have recognized the need for restraint, that have made discipline throughout the whole of life an integral part of their system, have generally been amongst the controlling forces of earth. And those nations which have allowed themselves to enjoy without continued effort, have usually been swept down by a flood of advancing manhood, trained in a school of noble virtue. It is a doubtful proposition that the rule of life is not, on the whole, favourable to the culture of the moral instincts.

In morals we deal with probable truth, since here it is not granted to us to handle absolute certitudes. Warburton has said that mathematics are bad if taken as the guide to life because they deal with certainties, whereas in the world a man must deal with probabilities. It is a true word. The careful calculations somehow do not work out the expected result. The prospectus proves deceptive, not because there is any intention to cheat, but because those who handle the affair persist in taking figures as an index to the real state of the world in which they work, forgetting that their knowledge of nature and man is limited, and that certitude cannot therefore be guaranteed.

Moral truth is never mediated to us in this rigid form. Indeed, we are not adapted to receive it, but are so constituted that in any given case we must be prepared to accept just that which we think to be, on the whole, the more likely thing to happen. We cannot find an argument that is irrefragable. There is no surety that we may not after all be mistaken, and the best that we can do is to make an accurate conspectus of the situation, see that we leave out nothing of importance, and then come to such a decision as we can. We are obliged to do this in dealing with the world, or with anything that concerns other men, and we ought not to expect a different rule in the realm of morals. There also we must take some risks, use our faculties as well as we can, and determine on one side or the other with the implements at our disposal.

Faliero's portrait was once painted on the wall of the Consistory Chamber in Venice. That space is now vacant, offering only a dull surface to the observer; fit type of the doom that waits on those for whom in this world there is no relation between truth and life. Once determine that no link exists between our conscience and the universe, and where once a mild eye might gaze through the patined floor of heaven, there is nothing seen but a darkness that chills the soul with fear.

The New Edition of Davidson's 'Hebrew Grammar.'[1]

By the Rev. J. A. Selbie, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

For many years the *Introductory Hebrew Grammar* of the late Professor A. B. Davidson of the New College, Edinburgh, has been the recognized text-book for students not only in the Colleges of the United Free Church of Scotland but in many other institutions. The fact that it has held the field so long and has passed through no fewer than eighteen editions is sufficient evidence of its excellence for the purpose for which its author intended it. Yet it must be confessed that the use of the book has not been unattended with difficulties. In the hands of a capable tutor it left little to be desired, but the student who with no other aid than that supplied by the *Grammar* sought to gain an acquaintance with the laws and principles of the Hebrew language was by no means always sure of

[1] *An Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, by the late Professor A. B. Davidson, Litt.D, LL.D., Edinburgh. Nineteenth Edition, revised throughout by John Edgar McFadyen, B.A. (Oxon.), D.D., Professor of O.T. Language, Literature, and Theology in U.F. College, Glasgow. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914. Price 7s. 6d.

his ground. The very fact that those who appreciate most the value of Dr. Davidson's work are men who have acquired a pretty thorough knowledge of Hebrew is significant. They are able to detect points that escape the notice of the beginner, and they can see the bearing of remarks that are obscure to him. There are not a few sections in which it has always seemed to us that considerably fuller explanations were needed for the sake of clearness. Hence we feel that the Publishers have acted wisely in asking Professor McFadyen of Glasgow to issue a new edition of the *Grammar*, in which the needs should be supplied which his experience of teaching has shown him to exist. The present writer may be allowed to add that his own very much shorter experience has impressed upon him the possibility and the necessity of improvement in the very same directions as are emphasized by Dr. McFadyen in his Preface. Let us note some of these.

It has long been recognized that sections 1–10 of the *Grammar* must be thoroughly grasped by the student if he is to understand the changes that Hebrew words undergo in process of inflection, and if he is to acquire accuracy in writing Hebrew poems. But, admirable as is Dr. Davidson's treatment of such subjects as the vowel system, the syllable, and the tone, very few students working without the aid of a tutor could be expected to attain to perfectly clear views on these all-important points. In these sections Dr. McFadyen has certainly effected a great improvement by his fuller explanations and illustrations.

Again, the relation between the small type and the main text in Dr. Davidson's *Grammar* has always appeared to us to be unsatisfactory. How frequently it happens that a statement of primary importance is buried in small type—a statement which is the key to the understanding of something in the text, but which, simply because it is in small type, is on that account overlooked by the student. Dr. McFadyen has adopted, we think, a wise course in practically abandoning the use of small type, and in taking up into the text all that was essential in those sections. This procedure has very materially enhanced the value of the *Grammar* to the private student, even if it may have created a problem for the Examination Board of the United Free Church of Scotland.

Another improvement introduced by Dr. McFadyen is the supplying of complete vocabularies before the exercises, so that the student is no longer compelled, at an early stage, to have recourse to the vocabularies at the end of the book. It is also an advantage to have exercises supplied to certain sections where they were wanting. It was a happy thought also to add to each Hebrew exercise a few sentences of unpointed Hebrew; for, as the author says, 'pointing is almost as useful as translating from English into Hebrew, and it has a fascination all its own.'

A serious defect in Dr. Davidson's *Grammar* was the want of an Index. This has been supplied by Dr. McFadyen, who has given us not only an Index of Subjects but also one of Hebrew Words.

In addition to these general indications of the improved plan of the present *Grammar*, we may briefly note certain sections where the modifications and additions have struck us as specially valuable:—§§ 17 and 19 on the Construct State and the Pronominal Suffixes; § 31 on the Verbal Suffixes; § 41 on nouns from Ayin Vaw and Ayin Yodh verbs; § 45 on apocopated forms and nouns from Lamedh He verbs; § 46, where there are some very useful expansions, especially on the Consecutive forms (par. III.), and the Participle as contrasted with the Imperfect (par. IV.); § 49 on the Particles, which contains much useful additional material on Adverbs and Conjunctions.

One or two criticisms may be permitted. Was it worth while to suggest that the original form of the Article may have been *han* instead of the traditional *hal*? Again, we are a little doubtful whether Dr. McFadyen has done well to banish the numerous references to unquoted Hebrew passages of the O.T., and to content himself with quoting a few well-selected illustrative passages. It is quite true, as he says, that not one student in a hundred ever looked up these passages; still, for the sake of that one student, it might have been well to leave the references (of course in small type). Personally we have looked up the whole of them (and by the way we have scarcely ever found a wrong reference), and the exercise has been profitable.

We would suggest as an improvement, in future editions, that the gender of nouns should be much more freely indicated, especially in the vocabularies before the exercises. This could be done most readily by marking only the feminine nouns, leaving it to be inferred that those not so indicated are masculine. Similarly an indication might be

given of plurals in *-ôth* where *-îm* might have been expected, and *vice versa*.

Finally, is not the statement in the Preface somewhat strong and calculated to alarm admirers of the old text-book, that 'with the exception of the vocabularies . . . and of the exercises for translation . . . little remains of the original *Grammar* but the order of the sections'? As a matter of fact, we should say that something like two-thirds of the text is practically identical with the old form to which we have been accustomed.

After a careful perusal of the whole work we have no hesitation in saying that Professor McFadyen has successfully accomplished the task he set himself, and we have no doubt that in its new form the *Grammar* will commend itself even more than its predecessor both to teachers and to students of the Hebrew language.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS.

Romans viii. 28.

We know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are the called according to his purpose.

There are two great sources of trouble to us in the world, and the Word of God provides a remedy for both. It casts a healing branch into every bitter spring.

The first source of sorrow is the awakened conscience. Revealing, as it does, our guilt and unworthiness, it fills the heart with fear and drives peace away from the mind. The gospel provides the remedy for this by showing how 'being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.'

The second source of sorrow is the mysterious providences of God, which often seem opposed to the grace of the gospel. The best of men, in the path of duty, meet with many trials and sorrows. We see matters in which we take a deep interest—in home and business, in Church and State—in such a condition that we are often involved in sore perplexity and much trouble. Here again the Word of God helps us, coming to our aid with the doctrine of Divine Providence. It tells us in so many words that all things are under the direction of Almighty Power, guided by infinite wisdom, therefore

Ill that God blesses is our good;
And unblest good is ill;
And all is right that seems most wrong,
If it be His sweet will.

It brings to our aid the doctrine of Divine Providence which is stated in the text.

Here, then, we have a statement of the doctrine of Divine Providence in the government of creation, a doctrine which we can state and illustrate, but which reaches far beyond the grasp of human understanding.

I.

Its Universality.

'All things.'

1. This is the assurance of the gospel. It assures the believer, and reassures him in many passages of the Bible, of the universal sweep of Divine providential government, and assures him that all is directed for his benefit. For example, we read, 'All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's.' Again, 'All things are for your sakes, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God.'

2. We do not recognize this as we ought. We only partially recognize it. When health is good and labour productive, when business is profitable and seasons fruitful, we recognize the benefit and comfort of these and can trace them up to God. When we can have opportunity of hearing the pure gospel, and circumstances are such as make it easy and pleasant to obey it; when temptations are few and weak, and the number of warm-hearted Christian people large and their helpful conversation keeps our spiritual life alive,—it is easy then to

recognize that the hand of God is with us. But when sickness or, it may be, death enters the home, when poverty comes, and distress is on all sides, when we see sin abounding and the love of the many waxing cold, when spiritual comforts are diminished or withdrawn,—how, we ask, can these work for good?

3. The answer, of course, is that it is in this way that sin is made hateful to us, temptation's power broken, the emptiness of the world made manifest and our attachment to it weakened. Thus Christ makes us feel our entire dependence on Him, strengthens the spirit of faith and prayer, makes us long for heaven and gird ourselves to prepare for it. Thus Christians learn to 'glory in tribulations also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.' And 'our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.'

'*All* things'! Yes! Just as darkness and light, shadow and sunshine, storm and calm, cold and heat, rain and fair, '*all* work together' to produce the harvest, so every vicissitude of joy and sorrow, poverty and plenty, trouble and peace, works, by Divine Providence, for the good of the Christian soul. Many a man has discovered this after long and sore discipline. Tauler, the great mystic, says: 'If a man loves God truly, and has no will except to God's will, the whole force of the Rhine river may rush at him and yet will not disturb him or interrupt his peace.' R. L. Stevenson, a man of very different type of mind, had to learn it by the hard discipline of sickness, and he says—

And methought that beauty and terror are only one, not two;
And the world has room for love, and death, and thunder, and dew;
And all the sinews of hell slumber in summer air;
And the face of God is a rock, but the face of the rock is fair.

The universality of it—the all-embracing sweep of the wisdom and love and power of Divine Providence—is the beauty of it that first claims attention.

II.

Its Harmony.

'All things work together.'

1. It is a remarkable fact that it was not till the Reformation brought into prominence the doctrines of grace that science, strictly speaking, became possible. And since then, the ever-widening area of human knowledge has only brought into ever greater prominence that wondrous harmony in nature which makes the whole universe move as under one great impulse from a Divine Governor. To us 'natural' or 'physical law' is a familiar phrase and speaks of the recognition of a wondrous co-operation in all created things. The very planets in their courses move like a wonderfully ordered machine. And the seemingly capricious winds, the rain and the dew, the sunshine and the cold, are all working together to keep this world sweet and clean and fit for the dwelling of man. But while men recognize this harmony and co-operation in nature, and delight to proclaim the supremacy of law therein, they are slow to recognize and acknowledge a like harmony and co-operation in all the vicissitudes of human life. Yet this is the plain teaching of our text—that our joys and sorrows are partners who 'work together' to bring us great profit. 'Events which seem to stir up our corruptions, and calamities which seem to tend to ruin, are so counteracted and combined with others that all may tend to our benefit, just as poisonous ingredients are so mixed and modified by other materials as to form some of our most powerful and salutary medicines.'

2. And so it is in the realm of human experience as illustrated by all the dealings of God with man. The sin of his brethren cast Joseph into an Egyptian dungeon, where he proved the saviour of his father's house and of multitudes besides. The flight of Onesimus from his master Philemon brought him into the company of Paul, and proved a blessing to all three. Events distant in time and place are harmonized by God for His Divine purpose. In the days of Joshua, the cities of the priests fell to them by lot wholly within the bounds of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, and the reasons were seen long centuries after when the temple rose in Zion and they were found near to the place where they were to minister. When Christ wished to gather His disciples from the islands of the South Seas there was nothing remarkable seen there. He began His work in Britain, and thence sent forth His agents to begin the glorious work. When events are made profitable by such remote combinations, we can never learn their influence by any sagacity of ours. We must trust Him with whom 'a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years,' and whose 'eye runs to and fro throughout the whole earth.' Though appearances

are bad, trust on! No difficulties can perplex, no obstacles oppose Him. In that day when the heavens shall declare His righteousness, His people will be filled with delight in viewing the display of wisdom, and goodness, and power, which will show what seemed confusion to be order, and seeming evil useful, and all events 'working together' for one end.

One may see in a mechanic's shop different men employed on different parts of a machine. One man makes the boiler, another the wheels, another the springs, another bolts and nuts, etc. And the boilermaker knows little about making wheels, and the wheelmaker has never tried to make bolts or nuts, but the master fitter knows something about all these things, and he assembles the parts and fits and combines them all so as to make them all take their place and do their work in one powerful machine working for some definite and useful end.

III.

Its Loving-Kindness.

'All things work together for good.'

1. This has already been partly illustrated; but the illustrations of the truth in history and biography and autobiography are so overwhelming that one is tempted to multiply illustrations and evidences of its truth. 'All these things are against me,' thought Jacob. He cried out, 'Joseph is not, and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away.' And he thought that these were the calamities which would ruin his house, and 'bring his grey hairs with sorrow to the grave.' But from the vantage-ground of history we can survey the whole story and see how every event that was accounted calamitous, and really seemed to be such, was really a blessing in disguise and tended to the preservation of his house and the fulfilment of the blessing promised to it. So, too, Joseph must have thought when his brethren cast him into the pit and left him to perish, and again when he marched as a slave in the caravan of the Midianites towards the borders of Egypt. Calamities seemed to come upon him as a cloud when he was thrust by his master into an Egyptian dungeon burdened with the reputation for evil deeds which his very soul abhorred, but all these things were but the dark background which made the wisdom of God illustrious in his eyes and in the eyes of all nations. 'All these things are against us' doubtless thought our Puritan fathers when, persecuted from city to city, they found no resting-place till beyond the western seas they founded an empire, the refuge of the oppressed and the home of a great and free nation.

In the days of Mary, Queen of England, Bernard Gilpin was condemned to suffer death in the city of London because of his Protestant faith. He was a man with whom this was a favourite text and who never tired of proclaiming this doctrine. The death-warrant had come, and he was being led forth to execution when he fell and broke his leg. He was carried back to his prison, and his execution was postponed till he should be able to walk to the scaffold. His gaoler cast his favourite doctrine in his teeth, and asked, 'Do you believe this additional misfortune to be for your good?' 'Yes,' said Mr. Gilpin, '"All things work together for good to them that love God," and this also.' And while he lay racked with pain, Queen Mary died. Elizabeth succeeded, and his recovery was the herald of his release, and not of his death.

Samuel Rutherford is continually preaching this doctrine in his writings. In one place he says: 'The saints seem to have the worst of it (for apprehension can make a lie of Christ and His love); but it is not so. Providence is not rolled upon unequal and crooked wheels; all things work together for the good of those who love God and are called according to His purpose. Ere it be long we shall see the white side of God's providence.' In another place he writes: 'I wondered once at providence, and called white providence black and unjust, but providence has another appearance to God than to us. And now we proclaim ourselves blind. We know that infinite wisdom is the mother of all His judgments, and that His ways pass finding out.'

2. Most of us have had some experience like these. We can remember our favourite plans thwarted and all our purposes laid in the dust, yet the end has been good. Let us therefore judge Providence with caution. Remember, 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' Let us say, 'I will wait on the Lord, who hideth himself from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him.' For, as we look back, we can sing how

> With mercy and with judgment
> My web of time He wove,
> And aye the dews of sorrow
> Were lustred by His love;
> I'll bless the hand that guided,
> I'll bless the heart that planned,
> When throned where glory dwelleth
> In Immanuel's land.

IV.

Its Limitations.

'To them that love God.'

1. On a railway line much depends on whether you are going with or going against the engine.

This text gives no assurance to those who despise God's mercy and trample on His grace. Our relation to God is our only security for it. This is as clearly put by the Psalmist as by the Apostle. In the 91st Psalm he says, 'Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the Most High, thy habitation; there shall no evil befall thee. . . . For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.' If we be not of the number who love God: if we be against His Son and therefore against Him, how different is the complexion of providence. Then prosperity is a curse weighted with sorrow and every seeming blessing weighted with vengeance. The very stars in their courses fight against the man who fights against God. God is with us and on our side only when we are with God and on God's side. Love to God and loyalty to Christ—this is the key that opens every dungeon door in the castle of Giant Despair.

2. For many a long generation the alchemists of East and West toiled and studied to find the philosopher's stone, *i.e.* a chemical combination which they conceived possible, which would have the effect of turning every baser metal into gold, when brought into contact with it. How they toiled and failed is matter of history. It was reserved for the disciples of Christ to succeed where they had failed—to have discovered to them by the Holy Spirit and to transmit to the world the open secret of the only true philosopher's stone. Love to God in Christ, 'this is the precious stone that turneth all to gold,' that changes losses into gains, crosses into crowns, afflictions and sufferings into themes for grateful praise. It changes death itself into the threshold of eternal and blessed life. There is no secret so well worth learning as this. There is none that reaches so deep and has such wide salutary influence over the troubles of life. Some kinds of knowledge are of more practical benefit and direct application than others, and some kinds are utterly barren. But there is no knowledge that for one moment can rival the knowledge of the love of God. At one step it passes the simple Christian far in advance of philosopher and sage.

V.

Its Certainty.

'We know.'

It was once a minister's sad duty to visit an old Highlandman and break to him the news of the death of his only son in a distant land. The old man bowed his head and groaned out this verse. Then drawing a deep breath, he cried, 'I don't see it, but it's not needful . . . *we know*.' Blessed is the man who has this assurance. Ill, to him, is no ill, but only good in a mysterious form. Losses enrich him. Sickness is his medicine for strengthening the soul. Reproach is his honour, for he remembers his Lord has said, 'Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake,' and death is his eternal gain. Happy is the man who is in such a case. He is secure when others are in peril. He lives when others die.

Remember then the universality, harmony, loving-kindness, limitations, and certainty of God's providence.

I will not doubt, though all my ships at sea
Come drifting home, with broken masts and sails;
I will believe the Hand which never fails,
From seeming evil worketh good for me;
And though I weep because those sails are tattered,
Still will cry, while my best hopes lie shattered,
'I trust in thee.'

I will not doubt though all my prayers return
Unanswered from the still white realm above:
I will believe it is an all-wise love
Which has refused these things for which I yearn,
And though at times I cannot keep from grieving,
Yet the pure ardour of my fixed believing
Undimmed shall burn.

I will not doubt, though sorrows fall like rain,
And troubles swarm like bees about to hive;
I will believe the heights for which I strive
Are only reached by anguish and by pain;
And though I groan and writhe beneath my crosses,
I yet shall see that my severest losses
Are greater gain.

I will not doubt. Well anchored in this faith,
Like some staunch ship, my soul braves every gale,
So strong its courage will not quail
To breast the mighty unknown sea of death.
O, may I cry, though body parts with spirit,
'I do not doubt,' so listening worlds may hear it
With my last breath!

Another Solution of Revelation xx.–xxii.

By the Rev. J. Agar Beet, D.D.

To Canon R. H. Charles, all students of Eschatology owe an unspeakable debt, especially for his translations of ancient Jewish documents bearing on this interesting topic and forming a link between the teaching of the Old Testament and that of the New. Of these I may mention, among many others, his admirable and most valuable edition of *The Book of Enoch*, which sheds a world of light on Jewish thought about the future in the centuries preceding the appearance of Christ; and his *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian, a Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, of which a new and enlarged edition was published some two years ago. In recent numbers of this magazine, Dr. Charles has called attention to certain difficulties in Rev 20–22; and has proposed a solution of them. These difficulties, and this proposed solution, I shall now discuss.

The difficulties mentioned are three. '1. First of all, it is a matter beyond dispute that 22^{15} 21^{27}, which state that outside the gates of the New Jerusalem evil in every form exists, but that it can in no wise pass within the gates of the holy city, prove that *the New Jerusalem here referred to was to descend before the disappearance of the first earth and the first heaven and the final judgment* described in $20^{11\text{-}15}$.'

'2. Verses 22^{2} $21^{24\text{-}26}$, $22^{14.\ 17}$ assume that the nations are still upon the earth, that the gospel is preached to them afresh from the New Jerusalem (as was prophesied already in 14^{6} 15^{4}), that they are healed thereby of their spiritual evils, their sins washed away, and a right to the tree of life given to them. . . . That the above prophecies can apply only to the New Jerusalem, which was to be the seat of the Millennial Kingdom, is too obvious to dwell on further.'

'3. It is finally to be observed that, since the earthly Jerusalem was in ruins and never in the opinion of the Seer to be rebuilt, a new city was of necessity to take its place as the seat of Christ's kingdom and the abode of the blessed martyrs, who were to come down from heaven to reign for 1000 years with Him.'

For the above reasons, Dr. Charles has come to the conclusion 'that the text in 20–22 *is disarranged in an astonishing degree and does not at present stand in the orderly sequence originally designed by our author.*' And he suggests, as 'apparently the only hypothesis that can account for the facts of the case,' 'that *John died . . . when he had completed* $1\text{–}20^{3}$ *of his work, and that the materials for its completion, which were for the most part ready in a series of independent documents, were put together by a faithful but unintelligent disciple in the order which he thought right.*' He accordingly gives, in his second paper, a 'Rearranged Translation' of Rev 20–22.

This rearrangement breaks up the manifest continuity of Rev $20^{1\text{-}10}$, which is dominated by the limited period of a 'thousand years,' a thread binding together ch. $20^{2.\ 3.\ 4.\ 5.\ 6.\ 7}$, and followed by revolt of unnumbered multitudes, who are 'consumed' by fire from heaven. Then follow the final punishment of Satan, the resurrection and judgment of the dead, good and bad, and the second death of all whose names are 'not found written in the book of life.' All this is followed by a vision of the 'New Jerusalem,' described with a dramatic grandeur which has fascinated, comforted, and strengthened untold myriads of the servants of Christ in all ages and Churches.

After a voice from the throne in ch. $21^{5\text{-}8}$, we have a second vision introduced in v.^{9} by words identical with others in ch. $17^{1.\ 3}$, and placing, in conspicuous contrast to 'Babylon, the mother of the harlots,' another figure, 'the Bride, the wife of the Lamb.' This is at once identified with 'the Holy City, Jerusalem,' in ch. 21^{2}, which is again described word for word as 'coming down out of heaven from God.' In the preliminary vision in vv.$^{1\text{-}4}$ we saw a city without tears or sorrow. We now see one in which 'the glory of God' makes needless the sun, and in which there is no night: chs. $21^{23.\ 25}$ 22^{5}. This implies, as is expressly stated in ch. 20^{11}, that our present solar system has passed away.

This magnificent and harmonious panorama, Dr. Charles breaks up by pushing back chs. 21^{9}–22^{2} to the beginning of the Millennium; thus replacing the one City depicted in all our ancient MSS. and versions by two cities separated by an

interval of 1000 years, each descending from heaven and supernatural; one of them abiding for ever, the other besieged by unnumbered foes led by Gog and Magog, and passing away with a fugitive universe at the appearance of the Judge of all mankind. Of these two cities, the permanent one, in Rev 21^{1-4}, is a feebler copy of the transient one, and 'the wife of the Lamb' in v.[9] disappears from the permanent City, to make a way for a mere comparison of the City to 'a bride adorned for her husband.' We now ask, What reasons are given for this marvellous disturbance of the harmonious vision portrayed in all our earliest copies?

The first proof is Rev 22^{15}: 'Outside are the dogs and the sorcerers and the companions of harlots and the murderers and the idolaters, and every one who loves and makes a lie.' This is in the Epilogue, ch. 22^{6-21}, after the close, in v.[5] of the vision of the City of God, and practically of the whole book and of the Bible as we possess it. The prophet remembers, with solemn awe, that not all those for whom Christ died will pass through the gates of pearl and walk the streets of gold. Around him are men walking in the broad path leading to destruction. He fears, as is assumed in Dn 12^{2}, Mt 25^{46}, Jn 5^{29}, 2 Th 1^{8}, Rev 20^{15}, etc., that in this evil path some will continue to the end. He is therefore compelled to place them, as a warning to his readers, 'outside' the City of God.

Moreover, in these chapters we have no hint that those cast into the lake of fire will be at once annihilated. Indeed, the plural form in ch. 20^{10} rendered 'shall be tormented' implies that 'the wild beast and the false prophet,' who 1000 years earlier (ch. 19^{20}) were cast into the lake of fire, were still suffering torment. This proves that to be cast into the lake of fire does not necessarily involve immediate extinction. And if the lost still exist, it must be 'outside' the City.

Similar considerations explain ch. 21^{27}: 'There shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, and he who makes an abomination and a lie.' Nor need we wonder to find in vv.[24-26] 'the nations . . . and the kings . . . and their glory.' For we can apprehend the unseen only in terms of the seen. The nations and kings are conspicuous in human life everywhere, and therefore colour the prophet's words. So Is 60^{11}, which is probably in his mind: 'Thy gates shall be open continually day and night: they shall not be shut: that men may bring to thee the wealth of nations, and their kings led captive.' This chapter cannot be literally fulfilled; but it is one of the most precious in the Old Testament.

That in Rev 22^{2}, 'the leaves of the tree are for healing of the nations,' is, like the 'river of water of life' and the 'tree of life' on its banks, a beautiful touch in the drapery of the metaphor. They can no more be explained in detail than can the fatted calf in the story of the prodigal son. In all symbolic speech we must distinguish between essential lessons and the rhetorical forms in which they are clothed. This applies to all interpretation of ancient prophecy.

Ch. 22^{14} reads, 'Blessed are they who wash their robes, that they may have the right *to come* to the tree of life, and by the gates may enter into the City'; and v.[17], 'The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he who hears, let him say, Come. And he who is thirsty, let him come; he who will, let him take the water of life freely.' These belong, like v.[15], to the Epilogue; and are parting words of encouragement to the readers, following the description of the City, and the completion of this Book.

The only other objection, viz. No. 3 quoted above, is altogether imaginary. For in ch. 20^{1-10}, the only passage in the Bible which speaks of a limited period during which the martyrs are to reign with Christ, to be followed by a tremendous final assault of evil, we have no hint of any visible return of Christ to earth, or of any visible city other than the earthly Jerusalem and earlier than the glorious City described in ch. 21^{1-4}. Nor have we here any suggestion of a bodily resurrection of the martyrs. Indeed, the word '*souls* of those beheaded' in ch. 20^{4} suggests disembodied spirits, as in ch. 6^{9}, 'I saw underneath the altar the *souls* of those slain because of the word of God.' These impatient souls, crying out for the punishment of their enemies, were certainly not living on earth in bodily forms.

The above objections, which are the only reasons given by Dr. Charles for his revolutionary disarrangement of the text given by all our ancient documents, are of no force against the serious objections mentioned above to the rearrangement he proposes; and are no justification for his introducing into the Book of Revelation two consecutive holy cities, described in similar

terms, one lasting for 1000 years and then besieged by enemies, and the other abiding for ever.

This failure to rearrange the text of the New Testament on internal evidence only warns us not hastily to set aside the abundant documentary evidence on which it rests, when this evidence is nearly unanimous. In the Old Testament, in the Pentateuch and elsewhere, such reconstruction has borne the test of criticism, and has produced results of great value. But the case of the New Testament differs greatly from the Old, in the infinitely greater abundance of the evidence at our disposal, in very early MSS, versions, and quotations in early Christian writers. During the last eighty years this evidence has been collected from many lands and carefully examined. The result is a perceptible change, in many details, of the Sacred Text. In not a few passages, the entire evidence known to us leaves us still in doubt. But these doubtful passages are not very important. Moreover, in the margin of the Revised Version, they are placed within reach of all intelligent readers of the English Bible. The rational certainty thus afforded, within definitely marked limits, touching the words actually written by the writers of the New Testament, has been an immense gain to theology and religion.

To assume that the Sacred Text is corrupt wherever we cannot understand it is a tempting way of escape from a difficult passage, but a dangerous one. For example, in Rev 2^{25}, Dr. Charles, without any documentary evidence, changes the words 'there shall be no night there' into 'shut day or night' as in Is 60^{11}, which seems to be in the writer's thought. The change in Rev 21^{25} from this earlier prophecy marks an important development in the New Testament as compared with the Old. Same thought repeated in Rev 22^{5}.

A wonderful agreement pervades the Eschatology of the various and very different writers of the New Testament. In all four Gospels, in the Book of Acts, in the letters of Paul and others, and in the Book of Revelation, we find a confident expectation of a definite moment in the future when, with a voice from heaven and an appearance of Christ, the present order of Nature will pass away, all the dead, good and bad, will be raised, and all will receive reward or punishment according to their works. So far, all is clear.

We need not wonder that, in view of the immense and sudden change in the religious outlook of the world caused by the appearance, teaching, death, and resurrection of Christ, His followers looked for His promised return at any early date, probably in the lifetime of some then living. This expectation was disproved by His non-appearance. But, in strange forms, it has lingered to our day.

The case is complicated by the assertion in Rev 20^{5}, and nowhere else in the Bible, that the souls of the martyrs, and perhaps of others, 'lived and reigned as kings with Christ 1000 years.' Upon this statement, strange theories have been built, including a premillennial coming of Christ, and His reign on earth for this limited period. This theory is disproved by the revolt of vast multitudes and the siege of the beloved city described in vv.$^{7-10}$. For we cannot conceive this siege while Christ was visibly reigning on earth; nor can we conceive Him leaving His servants, to make way for the siege. Moreover, we are not told that the reign of the martyrs with Christ was on earth. In ch. 6^{9}, the prophet saw their souls under the altar; apparently in heaven.

The simplest explanation of the Millennium is found in Jn 5^{24-29}, where we hear 'the voice of the Son of God' already speaking, and heard by some who, believing it, have 'passed out of death into life.' Then follows 'an hour when all who are in the graves will hear His voice and will go forth' to a 'resurrection of life' or of 'judgment.' This passage by no means removes all the difficulties in Rev 20^{1-10}, especially that of the final revolt. But, like the rest of the Book, it encourages the suffering servants of Christ in times of persecution. On the whole subject, I heartily recommend Professor H. B. Swete's admirable commentary on *The Apocalypse of John*; a work which Canon Charles seems to have entirely overlooked.

Interpret it as we may, the harmonious teaching of the New Testament about the Second Coming of Christ involves what is to us an insoluble difficulty, viz., the very long interval between faithful service on earth and the reward promised, not at death, but simultaneously at a definite moment in the future, at the close of the present order of things. This day of judgment and retribution is conspicuous throughout the New Testament; *e.g.* Mt $13^{30.41}$ 25^{31}, Jn $5^{28.29}$, Ac 17^{31}, 1 Co $15^{52.53}$, Ro 8^{11}, Ph $3^{20.21}$, 2 Ti 4^{8}, Rev 20^{11-15}. This difficulty some have endeavoured to lessen by suggesting that the sleep (1 Co 15^{20}) of the

righteous dead will be unconscious. But this is a mere guess; and the immense interval involved is unthinkable. We are glad to take refuge from it in Paul's confident assurance in 2 Co 5^8, that to be 'away from our home in the body' is to be 'at home with the Lord,' which in Ph 1^{23} he declares to be 'much better.' But this assured hope cannot set aside the much more abundant teaching quoted above. This difficulty, like so many others, remains unsolved.

Our only certainty, and one absolutely sufficient for all our needs, is the broad principle asserted in Gal $6^{7.8}$: 'Whatever a man sows, this he will also reap. He who sows for his own flesh, from his flesh will reap corruption: and he who sows for the Spirit, from the Spirit will reap life eternal.' This judgment is re-echoed and confirmed by the inborn moral sense of all men, an authority which speaks in the literature of all ages and races, and one from which there is neither escape nor appeal. All else must be left till the morning dawns, and the shadows flee away.

For the above reasons, in spite of my great respect of Canon Charles' most valuable contributions to Eschatology, I cannot accept his proposed rearrangement of Rev 20–22. And I resent his opinion that these chapters were put together in their present form by an 'unintelligent disciple' of the original writer. I cannot conceive a more fitting and glorious conclusion to this wonderful book of prophecy than these chapters as we have them in our Bibles, or a more fitting close to the sacred volume.

These various visions are not consecutive. For already in ch. 6^{17} we have 'the Great Day' to which all the New Testament writers look forward, and which is afterwards so graphically described in ch. 20^{11-15}. But the visions are progressive and intelligible. We have seven seals opened, seven trumpets, and seven bowls, each series apparently leading up to the great consummation, but each followed by further conflict. We have then, in chs. 19^{11}–21^4, seven visions, each introduced by the words 'and I saw'; and final visions of the City of God and the peacefully flowing River of the Water of Life.

The Book of Revelation stands, even as to its framework, in close relation to the Book of Ezekiel. The opening visions in Rev 1 and 4 present many points of contact with Ezk 1; *e.g.* the 'four living creatures,' man, lion, bullock, eagle; and the throne of God surmounted by a rainbow. The names 'Gog and Magog' in Rev 20^8 recall Ezk 38, 39. This being so, the resurrection of dry bones into a revived nation in Ezk 37 presents points of analogy with 'the first resurrection' in Rev $20^{5.6}$, which is followed in v.^{8} by the revolt of Gog and Magog. The vision of the restored temple in Ezk 40–48 may have suggested the vision of the New Jerusalem in Rev 21; and the river with trees on both banks, bearing fruit every month, with leaves for healing, may have suggested Rev 22^{1-3}.

The wild beasts 'coming up from the sea,' one like a leopard, so conspicuous from Rev $13^{2.11}$ onwards to ch. 20^{10}, recall Dn 7^3; and Rev 21^{24-26} recalls Is $60^{11.12}$. All this reveals a writer steeped in thought and phrase of the Old Testament.

But the whole Book of Revelation rises infinitely above all similar works, in the unique honour which it pays to Christ as an Object of the praises and worship of the brightest in heaven; and in its conspicuous reference to the death of Christ as a means of the salvation which He announced. It depicts faithfully the tremendous conflicts awaiting the servants of Christ, and the infinite triumph which will follow. Anything better fitted to encourage and strengthen them in days of persecution, or in our happier days and circumstances to shed light on the dark path which leads down to the cold river of death, I cannot conceive. Indisputably this book is a most precious gift of the ascended Saviour to His faithful servants in the conflicts of life on earth; and we have good reason to believe that in our English Bible, especially in the Revised Version, we have it, in all essentials, as it was originally written.

Literature.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK.

Why is it that the biography of a successful man is itself so rarely a success? Is it due to envy, jealousy, and all uncharitableness on our part? Or is it a conviction and confirmation of Augustine's 'O beata culpa!' The man who is conscious of no sin is at any rate judged by men as the chief of sinners. And the man who is uniformly successful in this life is dismissed from our deepest thought as one who verily has had his reward.

Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury, was one of the most successful men of his day and generation. And his biography is not a success. That is due partly to the biographer, whose hand is flabby and his proof-reading faulty. The former defect goes all through the book. Of the latter one example is enough. On page 132 of the second volume Sir John Lubbock is said to have been sixty-seven in 1901, on page 149 he is only sixty-six in 1902.

There is no denying it that Sir John Lubbock deserved his success. He worked as hard as that other very successful man, the first Earl of Selborne, and he was invariably kind and courteous and tactful. More than that, he lived virtuously. One who was a friend almost from childhood said to the biographer, 'I do not believe that he once, in the whole course of his life, did a thing that he thought to be wrong.' His conduct had much to do with his accomplishments. He wasted no time, either on sin or on repentance. His conscience was as the noonday clear. And his biographer justly remarks that, 'in fact, the facility with which he accomplished his intellectual tasks is to be credited to the strength of his moral character as much as to his purely mental power.'

He was successful in *all* his undertakings. And they were very many. His biographer, Mr. Horace G. Hutchinson, will not admit that, as one said, 'he touched life at every point'; for he knew nothing about art or music. But 'In Lord Avebury,' said one of the daily papers after his death, 'there has been removed one of the most accomplished of England's amateur men of science, one of the most prolific and successful authors of his time, one of the most earnest of social reformers, and—what is not perhaps generally known—one of the most successful law-makers in the recent history of Parliament.' And this wonderful catalogue omits the official business of his life. He was a banker, and 'he was not only eminently successful in the ordinary conduct of the banking business which came to him as a heritage, but carried through many reforms and exercised a preponderant influence in such large and important operations as those undertaken by the Council of Foreign Bondholders—to name but one of many instances.'

His success was due somewhat to his adaptability. He was 'singularly adroit,' said somebody. His biographer agrees, and adds, 'He would take the means which seemed best to him, but if he failed of success by those means he would immediately turn, with remarkable suppleness and dexterity, and recommence the attempt to attain his end by some other means.'

And he was always courteous. His courtesy won him many successes. It won him his second wife. This is the story: 'His very first meeting with Miss Fox Pitt was characteristic of his unfailing kindliness and thought for other people. The party was a large one, and she, a girl of eighteen, a niece of the house, had come down late for breakfast. It appears that he had not seen her the previous night. She received a sharp scolding from her aunt. Those were days when unpunctuality for breakfast, or perhaps even breakfasting in bed, were not a habit as they now are. The rest of the party rose from the table and left the young girl alone—all except Sir John, who remained to keep her company and to attend to her wants.'

He was for thirty years or thereby close neighbour and friend of Darwin and accepted the great theory as heartily as did Huxley. 'Nevertheless,' says Mr. Hutchinson, 'we find him, when at home on the Sundays, sedulously attending the services at the village church. More than that, I have been told by one who has the best of all opportunities of knowing, that on no single morning of his life until death was closing upon him did he omit to read a chapter of the Bible before commencing the long day's work.'

It is altogether admirable. And yet the scrap of a biography of Adèle Kamm, all suffering and sacrifice, is far more interesting. The title is *Life*

of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury (Macmillan; 2 vols., 30s. net).

WHO'S WHO.

There is no Annual more widely useful than *Who's Who*, the volume of which for 1915 is published (A. & C. Black; 15s. net). Other Annuals meet the needs of their particular constituencies. Even Whitaker's Almanack is more political than general. But the proper study of all mankind is man, and 'nihil humanum a me alienum' is said by everybody, and *Who's Who* is the Annual of all the world. Not of all the English-speaking world only, but of all the world, for it contains biographies of foreigners in plenty.

We wish, all the same, that it contained more foreigners' biographies. It is rarely that we turn to it for an Englishman, Scotsman, or Irishman, or even prominent Colonist, to be disappointed. But some eminent foreigners, especially if they are eminent in scholarship, have escaped the editor's net.

Here are a few names in alphabetical order—Amélineau, Anesaki, Asin-y-Palacios, Basset-René, Bethe, Bezzenberger, Boissier, Bonucci, Boudinhon, Brandt, Brockelmann, Brückner, Cabaton, De Boer, Delbrück, Derenbourg, Deubner, Deussen, Dhalla, Dobschütz, Doutté. They may not be well known, but they deserve to be, and they would be better known if *Who's Who* would take them in.

How to do it, is the question. We suggest that some of the biographies could be cut down by omitting mere incidents in the lives and by cutting out the titles of mere pamphlets. The titles of *books* must not be omitted. No source more accessible or more reliable than *Who's Who* for discovering the books a man has written and their exact titles and dates is in existence.

But all that has been well thought out by this most accomplished and exact of editors, and we take too much upon us. It is the indispensableness of *Who's Who* that is our excuse. We want it as near practical perfection as possible.

CHURCH HISTORY.

If it is possible for Protestants to profit by any book on the History of the Church written by a Roman Catholic, the book is *A Manual of Church History*, written by the late Professor F. X. Funk of Tübingen, and now translated into English by P. Perciballi, D.D., and edited by W. H. Kent, O.S.C. (Burns & Oates; 2 vols., 7s. 6d. net each).

The translation is far better than might have been expected, altogether excellent indeed. One thing the English-speaking editor might have done: he might have added to the valuable lists of literature a few English titles here and there in addition to those which seem to have been known to Professor Funk. Nevertheless we are grateful to him for the work he must have done on the translation itself.

The literature is an important feature of the book. For the book is written for students. Dr. Funk's aim seems to have been to give, not merely the history of the Church, but also the history of its history. The consequent appearance of the page does not encourage the ordinary reader to read it; but even the ordinary reader will find that the pages are all quite readable. And especially will he find a breadth of sympathy and a candour of statement which he will have some difficulty in seeing surpassed by Protestant historians of the Church. We shall give an example in a moment. But first let us say that the scholarship is reliable and that every aid in the form of synoptical table and the like has been offered the student in addition to clear statement and clever characterization.

This is Professor Funk's conclusion: 'In the course of centuries, Christians have been divided into numerous separate bodies, some of which, after a longer or shorter period of existence, have disappeared, whilst others have survived till our own day. The most important of these separations took place in the eleventh and sixteenth centuries, in the first place parting the east from the west, and afterwards extending into the Church of the west, and dividing the new world soon after its discovery between Catholic and Protestant nations. This state of affairs cannot but grieve the Christian mind, which abhors schism and desires unity, according to the words of the Apostle to the Ephesians, "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace . . . one body and one spirit . . . one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all" (Eph iv. 3–6). The defection of the sixteenth century in the western Church is especially to be deplored. It was, however, not an unmixed evil, for it was the occasion of an awakening in the Catholic Church,

which gave rise to salutary reforms. It has often been asked whether without this division there would ever have been a reform in the Church. A negative answer would deny the vital force of the Church, but it must be admitted that the measures of reform had perhaps been too long delayed, and that they were only carried into effect when the Church had been shaken to her foundations and been deserted by many of her children. History teaches us that not only were the reforms carried out after the defection, but that they were accelerated and carried out because of that very defection. Thus the renovation of the Church is historically connected with the schism.

'This schism not only hastened the work of reform in the sixteenth century, but continued to exercise an influence even after that period. The old Church was strengthened in the consciousness of unity, when a new Church arose in the west. To that great movement may be attributed her increased internal solidity, and the fact that since that time there has been no other schism, and the Papal elections have been conducted with order and regularity, as compared with the disturbances of former days. The recent mingling of various sects, which had formerly held aloof from each other, is not an unmixed evil. In those countries where it has taken place, religious life is much more flourishing at present than in others. This is an undeniable fact, nor is it difficult to see the reason, viz., that opposition rouses each sect to greater care and more vigorous efforts. It is, therefore, possible to judge more favourably of these events than might have seemed possible at first sight. Nevertheless, that schism is an evil is the conviction not only of Catholics, but also of many thousands of Protestants. But it exists, and it seems to have a long period of existence before it. We must console ourselves with the advantages to be derived from it, and firmly trust in the Lord of the Church, who, though His ways are hidden from men, extends His protecting hand over the Church He has founded, faithful to His promise to His disciples: "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20).'

PROFESSOR FLINT.

The Rev. Donald Macmillan, M.A., D.D., who wrote 'The Life of George Matheson,' has now written *The Life of Robert Flint* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net).

It is a larger book. The man was greater. But the greater man does not always have the larger biography. This biography might have been smaller and thereby better. To make it so large, Dr. Macmillan has been compelled to quote freely from Professor Flint's published works instead of telling us to read them for ourselves, or taking it for granted that we had read them already, as he very well might have done. He has been compelled to do this. He could not otherwise have written so large a book. For Professor Flint kept no diary worth speaking of, wrote few letters worth preserving, and took no leading part in any great controversy or public movement. He was a great man and deserved a great biography, but it would have been greater if there had been less in it.

Otherwise it is well done. There is a fine ease about the writing of it which the practised biographer alone attains to, an ease that very rarely descends to familiarity. And, best of all, it gives a true likeness of the man. In that essential matter the biography is better than the painting done by Sir George Reid and reproduced in the volume. We do actually see Flint as we knew him, neither more nor less. It is the achievement of only the very best biography.

Professor Flint was a student first of all. Whatever he did he did well, and he did it well because he prepared for it. He prepared for his sermons when he was a preacher; and he prepared for his prayers. He prepared for his prayers also when he was a professor. He probably never stood up to commend the hour of lecture to God without knowing to the very language what he was to say. For a long time he wrote his prayer and read it.

Let us confirm these words from the biography: 'There is one feature of his conduct of worship while he was minister of the East Church and afterwards at Kilconquhar that deserves to be specially noted, and that is the supreme importance which he attached to the devotional part of the service. I have before me as I write three notebooks, all of which are filled with prayers that he composed during his ministry in Aberdeen. He must have written a fresh one for every Sunday. These prayers would of themselves stamp him as a remarkable man—remarkable for his absolute belief and trust in God, and for the closeness of his walk

with Him and childlike confidence in His will.'

That is one passage. Then—'All Flint's students have but one opinion of the profound impression produced upon them by his opening prayers. They sounded the note for the day, a note of absolute dependence upon the Revealer of all truth, for enlightenment and guidance in their work. These prayers, as we have already seen, were carefully prepared and written out by Flint; they are to be found scattered through his note-books, sometimes on slips of paper and occasionally prefixed to a lecture.'

This is still better—'The most striking thing of all in each day's work—the most impressive act of all—was the prayer with which he began the day's work. There we were—130 of us or so, finding our several ways like the members of a great herd to our accustomed places, and having found them, chatting away about all sorts of things in church and state—sharpening pencils, preparing notebooks; a hum, a buzz, a rustle over all. And then the retiring-room door opened; a little spare alert figure hastened to the platform with exactly that shy sideways-looking expression in the Sir George Reid portrait, so sideways-looking and uncertain in his walk as to give one at times the impression of lameness. The next moment we were on our feet with heads bent, minds waiting, ears straining, listening to the few short sentences of agonized and agonizing pleading with which he cast himself and us all on the mercy of God in Christ. Pardon for our sins, strength for our need, the strength needful for this day and its duties; just a few short sentences, but they seemed to rise out of infinite depths of helplessness and of trust, the cry of a strong man in his utter weakness and absolute dependence upon God. It was an instruction to us that we should prepare the devotional part of our Sunday service before we took up the preparation of our sermon; we know that this was his own custom for each day's lecture. And as we ponder his precept and recall his example and think of our foolishness in the neglect of both, we get very near the secret, the greatest of all the secrets, perhaps, of our failure on the Sabbath day. His prayer was a wrestling with God and a prevailing; the hard won victory of faith over a stubborn wilfulness and out of the midst of a great weakness.'

This, then, is the secret of the man, and it is a great thing that Dr. Macmillan has brought it out so clearly. No more has to be said. Flint's learning was a wonder to the world. We now see that it was his by self-discipline. Young men who want to live will scarcely find a better book than this.

THE ASIATIC DIONYSOS.

By calling her book *The Asiatic Dionysos* (Bell; 10s. 6d. net), Miss Gladys M. N. Davis, M.A., tells us at once which theory of the origin of the wine god she supports. There are three theories.

First, Dionysos came from Egypt. So said Herodotus. But in modern times this is the opinion of Foucart alone among scholars. Miss Davis finds a fatal objection in the existence of Soma (or Haoma), a god so familiar to Dionysos as to make independence impossible, and yet a god who has nothing to do with Egypt.

Next, Dionysos came from Thrace. For this view the great majority of modern scholars contend. But 'if we accept the Thracian theory,' says Miss Davis, 'we have to explain the existence of a parallel such as Soma and interpret the references to the connection of Dionysos with Phrygia, Crete, and India. This can only be done by saying that the Thracians were the proto-Aryans, and that the Soma-cult, or cult of Dionysos, starting in Thrace in very remote times, spread into Asia and Greece subsequently.'

So she believes that Dionysos came from Asia, and argues for the belief throughout this volume with ability and energy.

May we add, since the author refers to two books, authorities on her subject, which she has been unable to consult, that she has also missed Deussen's *Upanishads* (translated into English by Geden) and two important articles directly bearing on her subject in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, Farnell on Greek Religion, and Milne on the Græco-Egyptian Religion.

PRINCIPAL FAIRBAIRN.

The Life of Andrew Martin Fairbairn, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., First Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, has been written by Dr. W. B. Selbie, who succeeded him as Head of the College (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net).

It is the life of a personality. Dr. Fairbairn

might not attract. He did, indeed, very often repel, both from the peculiarity of his position and from his own disposition. But he could not be overlooked. If there was any probability of his being overlooked for a moment, he saw to it that he was not overlooked for more than that moment. For he believed in himself and in his mission. And he was always ready to utter his beliefs.

The biography is not unattractive. It is candid. Dr. Selbie has made no promise to introduce us to a hero or a saint. The story, moreover, is of a self-made man, and it is not probable beforehand that we shall be drawn to a self-made scholar any more than we are drawn to a self-made tradesman. Yet it is just the fact that Fairbairn used his poor opportunities in youth to such good purpose, and made himself a place and a power in the world, that gives his biography its value. We are in no danger of worshipping success in him; he himself will take care of that; but we do rejoice in his prosperity, and follow his progress with pretty keen sympathy. It was progress never made easily, often with real anguish of soul.

He was born, and lived the first half of his life, in Scotland. He never got over that. He attached himself in early manhood to one of the smallest of Presbyterian Churches. He never got over that. A Scotsman and a Morisonian became the leader of Nonconformity in England. Dr. Horton travelled with him once in Italy, and says: 'I had the privilege of taking him over Rome, which he had never seen; but even the wonder and delight of Rome did not evoke the spirit of the man as the following incident did. It was at Assisi. We were visiting the Portiuncula; and at that time there was a Franciscan Brother, named Fra Bernadino, who had a great knowledge of English, and received English visitors with a courtesy which aimed at their conversion to the Holy Roman Church. After we had seen the various sights of the great church, Father Bernadino presented us with a little card, on which was printed a prayer for the conversion of England, and he asked us all to repeat constantly this prayer. Dr. Fairbairn was moved to the very centre of his being; his mouth and face worked as I have seen them work on the platform, or in the pulpit, when he was launched upon one of his greatest efforts. "The conversion of England!" he asked. "What to, and what from?" "Is there," he said, "a Catholic scholar in England to whom an intelligent man can go to learn the truth of religion or of Christianity?" The unhappy Father Bernadino ventured to mention one scholar who had a great repute in Catholic circles. "A pairfectly ignorant man!" fumed out the little Doctor. Father Bernadino appeared as if Vesuvius had broken over him, and humbly retreated into deferential silence. I think he had no idea that anything so explosive and decisive and intelligent could be contained in the unpretentious body of the Scotchman and the Protestant.'

Thus they could tell stories of the Scotsman and Morisonian, and laugh a little. But there lay his strength, and they knew it.

His history is of a pastorate in Bathgate, a fuller and rather notable ministry in Aberdeen, the principalship of Airedale College in Bradford, and the foundation of Mansfield College in Oxford. A man of so great learning, his proper place was Oxford. Viscount Bryce says that his learning and his literary gifts had from the first commended him to the theological and historical scholars of the place. And he adds, 'Lord Acton, the most learned Englishman then living, once said to me that he doubted if there was any one in the university whose learning equalled Fairbairn's.' Yet Oxford was not the home of his intellect. Dr. Horton saw that 'the spirit of John Knox and of the Covenanters always slept under those piles of erudition and that acquired moderation of language.' And Fairbairn himself, writing to Dr. Sanday in explanation of an article in the *Contemporary Review*, to which Sanday had made some kindly reference, spoke of Oxford as not his only world. 'Were Oxford my only world, this polemical production would never have appeared.'

But if Oxford was not the home of his intellect, it was the home of his heart. 'They never knew Dr. Fairbairn,' says the Rev. T. H. Martin, 'who did not know him in his own home circle, and it is good to know that the last three years or more of his life were spent in the happy seclusion of his own family, his public engagements over, his engrossing study laid aside, and all that he was as husband and father and friend free to assert itself.' And not with his family only, but also with his men he was at home in Oxford. There is nothing in the book more beautiful than the story of his return from India and the welcome of his men. 'The doctor was evidently much moved, and could not speak to us. We, too, could scarcely speak, but

managed to tell him, by our enthusiasm mainly, that we were very glad to see him back again.'

TREITSCHKE.

Treitschke: His Life and Works (translated into English for the first time) is the title of a volume published by Messrs. George Allen & Unwin, which is sure to have a large circulation (7s. 6d. net). Not that it is an attractive book. But Treitschke is getting credit for the horror of the War, more perhaps, and certainly more deservedly, than Nietzsche. And it is a book to make us think. Treitschke was a patriot. His Life was written by Professor Adolf Hausrath, and is here translated. It was written with intense devotion and much genuine sympathy. And it is the life of one who put his country before all else, before himself, before his neighbour, and before his God. 'According to my political doctrine,' he said, 'even one's good name is to be sacrificed to the Fatherland, but only to the Fatherland.' And wherever he spoke, he drew the patriot to him. On the eve of the Franco-German War his popularity was boundless. 'At the general drinking bout improvised by the students prior to going to the front or to barracks, Treitschke was received as if he had been the commander-in-chief.' 'Hundreds rushed forward with raised glasses eager to drink his health. The shouts of enthusiasm threatened the safety of floor and ceiling.'

He did not carry everybody with him always. Even among patriots, and even among his private friends, there were those who saw into the future and feared. There were those who knew that he was scarcely sane: 'At the Théatre Français my travelling companion, when listening to the patriotic ravings of Ernani, the highwayman, whispered to me, "Exactly like Treitschke!"'

He recognized no rights but the rights of the Fatherland, no law but the law of might. Of Alsace-Lorraine after the War he said, 'We have the intention to Germanize this newly acquired German province; we have the intention and will carry it out.' And when Professor Hausrath told him of the acquisition of the Cameroons—'Cameroons!' he exclaimed. 'What are we to do with this sand-box? Let us take Holland; then we shall have colonies.'

He was not an irreligious man. But he turned his religion, as he turned everything else, into what he called Patriotism. 'He praised the Bible for placing before us a number of the most magnificent wars and warriors.' And his morality was as his religion. 'Every new volume of Treitschke's historical work took a more one-sided Prussian view than the previous one; he excused in Prussia what he considered a crime in Austria, and regarded with particular contempt the Small States and their Liberalism.'

The works here translated are *The Army*, *International Law*, *First Attempts at German Colonisation*, *Two Emperors*, *Germany and the Neutral States*, *Austria and the German Empire*, *The Alliance between Russia and Prussia*, and *Freedom*.

Those who wish to be fully persuaded in their own minds as to the righteousness of the war, or wish to persuade others, should see *Germany and Europe*, by Mr. J. W. Allen, Barclay Lecturer in Modern History at Bedford College, University of London (Bell; 2s. 6d. net).

A well-illustrated and most interesting volume has been issued in order to describe the work of the Church of Scotland Guild among the Himalayas. The title is *A Gladdening River* (A. & C. Black; 1s. net). The author is the Rev. D. G. Manuel, B.D.

Professor Cheyne has written a book in the interests of Peace and of Goodwill among the Nations of the Earth. He prints at the beginning of it the Manifesto of the Society of Friends called forth by the declaration of War. And he proceeds in the spirit of that fine document, trying to commend other forms of faith to our acceptance, especially Bahaism, of which he is now a devoted adherent. On the title-page of the book he calls himself 'Ruhani' and 'Priest of the Prince of Peace,' and afterwards explains that Abdul Baha when in Oxford graciously gave him a 'new name'—Ruhani, that is, spiritual. The title of the book is *The Reconciliation of Races and Religions* (A. & C. Black; 6s. net). It is dedicated: 'To my dear wife, in whose poems are combined an ardent faith, an universal charity, and a simplicity of style which sometimes reminds me of the poet seer William Blake; may she accept and enjoy the offering, and may a like happiness be my lot when the little volume reaches the hands of the Ambassador of Peace.'

Mr. Stanley A. Cook, M.A., has written a book on *The Study of Religions* (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net). Hitherto Mr. Cook has been known as an Old Testament scholar, and it is no surprise to find much of the evidence for his arguments in this book taken from the Old Testament. It is as welcome as it is expected. For there is never any fear that the Old Testament will be used by Mr. Cook apologetically or with deficient scholarship. And there is not a little light thrown on the Old Testament as well as on the Study of Religion.

The book deals with principles. It is certainly not occupied, as so many books on Religion have recently been occupied, with theories and their advocacy. Mr. Cook wishes the students of Religion to approach the subject along right lines; and one of the first necessities of a right approach, he tells us, is to discard all the theories which we have already formed. Only when we come to it with an open mind can we learn what Religion is. There are three attitudes, he says, and he has objection to them all:

'The first is the sincerely and devoutly religious, which tends to be conservative and traditional, and may resent all criticism of religion. The second is the rationalistic and explicitly anti-religious, which, unfortunately, tends to be anything but rational. And the third is the neutral, specialistic, and sympathetic attitude of research, which, however, is apt to forget that, being specialistic and analytical, it is inevitably incomplete and one-sided, and, in its endeavour to be unprejudiced and "objective," may verge upon the anti-religious and unsympathetic.'

The study of Religion is before us. Mr. Cook believes that it will occupy our mind very largely in the future. 'It is imperative that religion should be studied critically, with the aid of the best scholarship, with a rational sympathy and a sympathetic rationalism.'

Greatheart is the Boys' and Girls' Missionary Magazine of the United Free Church of Scotland. Its editor is the Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E. Editors for children must be born; they can never by any art or industry be made. From cover to cover this magazine is for children, every page throbbing with interest. The publisher is Mr. John Cochrane, 121 George Street, Edinburgh.

Messrs. Constable have issued a fourth edition of *The Development of the European Nations, 1870–1900*, by J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. (7s. 6d. net). They have done wisely. No book that we have seen gives the history of that period so clearly, and perhaps none gives it so authoritatively. It is true that 'authority' is scarcely a word applicable to history that is so recent. But at least it can be asserted that Dr. Rose has worked as hard to ascertain his facts as any man has done, and he has no appreciable axe to grind. The War has made this period of European history one that we must be acquainted with. The book has done well already. Three editions exhausted since 1905 is good encouragement. But it will do better now. That is why the publishers have been wise to issue the handsome volume just now and at a reasonable price.

Mr. G. K. Chesterton's *G. F. Watts* (Duckworth) has three things to arrest our attention — the name of Watts, the name of Chesterton, and its illustrations. We are ready to read anything about G. F. Watts; we are ready to read anything by G. K. Chesterton; we are ready to read any book that is so plentifully illustrated with photogravures. This is the fourth reprint.

Mr. T. N. Foulis is the publisher of a completed edition of the Works of Nietzsche translated into English, and he is ready to issue cheap 'War' copies of at least some of the books. The first to come is *Beyond Good and Evil* (1s. net).

The Life of Lord Radstock, the evangelist, has been written by Mrs. Edward Trotter. The title is *Lord Radstock: An Interpretation and a Record* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). It has been written well. There is appreciation without adulation. There is sympathy with his aims, together with criticism of some of his methods. The book will be read with great pleasure by those who believe in the New Birth.

'Three distinct thoughts mark the progress of Lord Radstock's whole career. *First*, the fact of the free Grace of God irrespective of all merit, manifested in the love of Christ, which captures the heart where the law of asceticism fails. Restraints are good, but the constraint of love alone has power. Only the heart can capture the heart. He was not the mariner bound to the mast with

stopped ears, but one for whom the divine music allured the soul.'

'The *second* thought which shaped his life was that of the mystic union between Christ and His Church. Those realities which exist in the divine will and purpose soaring far above human experience were the inspiration of his message.'

'The *third* great thought which dominated his life in later years was an increasing realization of the universality of man's need and of the suitability of the Christ to meet that need in all its claims, both East and West. Those universal yearnings and that often inarticulate cry which is a characteristic of every human heart drew forth from him his deepest sympathies. His soul was much enlarged towards the seekers after God outside Christendom, and it was that Community of understanding which won for him in so large a measure the heart of India. He was invited by an Indian mystic to spend a period of silence and adoration with him and other mystics among the hills, so great was the sympathy in the Unseen which, in spite of all distinctions of race and creed, formed a bond between them. A distinguished Indian official quoted the father of Rabindranath Tagore and Lord Radstock as representing to him the ideal of saintship.'

But the biographer acknowledges an element of incompleteness in Lord's Radstock's life. He repudiated the claims of the intellect. He gave it little place in the apprehension of the things of God. 'He did not see the extension of divine claims to the whole being, and to a great extent refused the intellect its part in the redemption of the man.'

Experience (Kelly; 3d. net) is a quarterly magazine which is as exceptional in quality as in size. In size it is as long as an octavo and as narrow as a duodecimo. Its quality may be appreciated if the article is read on 'Privately.'

The Rev. John Blacket has celebrated a twofold centenary, the Centenary of the Methodist Missionary Society and the Centenary of Australian Methodism, by publishing a volume on *Missionary Triumphs among the Settlers in Australia and the Savages of the South Seas* (Kelly). It is not a mere collection of anecdotes. There are anecdotes in it, not a few and not ineffective, but they come in their place in the history. It is a history written with considerable literary skill and considerable historical imagination. Above all, it is written with deep sympathy and large faith.

The *Young Man* and the *Young Woman* end their volumes for the year with excellent Christmas numbers (Kingsley Press; 3d. each). The *Young Man* is literary; the *Young Woman* is domestic. That is so at least predominantly. There is literature in the *Young Woman*, and the domestic affections are not altogether forgotten in the *Young Man*.

When Messrs. Macmillan resolve to produce an édition de luxe of an author they leave little undone to make it what it ought to be. The édition de luxe of Macaulay is *The History of England*, by Lord Macaulay, edited by Charles Harding Firth, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, of which the fifth volume has been published (10s. 6d. net). Macaulay himself would have been satisfied with such an edition as this.

Professor Firth never thrusts himself forward, but he is present on every page, and not merely where there are illustrations. The illustrations certainly have cost him great labour. They are a selection of the best from a vastly greater possibility. Seven of them in this volume are in colour, one of these—Robson's Glencoe—being particularly effective. But the writing itself has been edited with the utmost care. This is no edition to lay on the shelf for show; it is the only edition to read.

A volume of *Choice Sayings* from the expository writings of Mr. Robert C. Chapman has been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott (1s. net).

A book about the prayers in the Bible was written not long ago by Professor McFadyen. That was a book worth buying. We cannot say the same of a book called *Men who Prayed*, which has been written by Mr. Henry W. Frost (Morgan & Scott). It also is about the prayers in the Bible, but each prayer, from Adam's (a curious prayer, surely) to Malachi's, is simply quoted, and some commonplace remarks are made to follow it. It takes more work than this to make a book.

Mr. Frederick C. Glass has succeeded in making his book, *With the Bible in Brazil* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), thoroughly interesting, and

sometimes even exciting. He had incidents enough to describe, and he can describe them. His gift of direct narration would have given him a place as a writer of novels had he been so misguided. He has a strong face, and he is evidently a strong man. The book is illustrated.

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have issued another volume of their 'Children's Missionary Series.' It will be remembered that one of the volumes of the series was made the basis of a children's sermon which was published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and which showed how truly the volumes are suited for the instruction of the little ones. They are just as suitable for their enjoyment. For they are well written and illustrated in colour. The new volume is *Children of Wild Australia*, by Herbert Pitts (1s. 6d. net).

There are men to whom the clerical club is their nearest experience of Paradise on earth. They delight in theology and the discussion of it. One of these men was the Rev. R. G. Forrest, D.D., minister of West Coates, Edinburgh. He not only delighted in the clerical club, he prepared for it. In paper, as in debate, he gave his best to it. So it is most fitting that, a memorial of a charming personality being prepared, it should be decided to publish a volume containing five of his contributed papers. They are well worth preserving. Dr. Robertson of Whittingehame introduces Dr. Forrest to us after the best chairman's manner, and then we have the privilege of the papers, one at a time or all on end, as we please. Their subjects are—(1) 'The Evangelical Principle'; (2) 'Back to Calvary'; (3) 'The Risen Christ and the Christian Life'; (4) 'Our Need of Theology'; and (5) 'The Theology we Need.' The title of the volume is *Christ the Corner Stone* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 2s. net).

At the Pilgrim Press there is published a volume of *Studies in Religious Knowledge*, being a First Year's Reading Course for Senior Scholar Training Classes (1s. 6d. net). The author is Thiselton Mark, D.Lit., B.Sc., Lecturer on Education in the University of Manchester. It is the first of two text-books intended for the use of senior scholars who are willing to enter upon a two years' course of study with a view to becoming teachers.

The Cole Lecturer for 1914 was Dr. Francis J. McConnell, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The subject of lecture was *Personal Christianity* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). Under that title Dr. McConnell discussed 'Instruments and Ends in the Kingdom of God.' He believes that we are always in danger of confounding the instrument with the end and exalting the instrument as if it had independent value. What is the end of Christianity? What is that for which Christ died? 'Our religion,' says Bishop McConnell, 'aims at the unfolding and enrichment of the life of human beings. The needs of persons are uppermost in value and have the right of way. All else is instrumental.'

He does not despise the instrument. A long and admirable chapter is given to the recognition of its importance. But he never wearies in exalting the end. It is not Bibles or Churches that God desires, it is the love of the human heart.

Mr. Alfred W. Benn has corrected and partly rewritten his volume on *The Greek Philosophers* for a second edition (Smith, Elder & Co; 18s. net). The change is considerable. In a new Preface the author tells us that he has completely changed the first part of the book, both as to matter and form. The chapter dealing with early Greek thought has been made into two chapters; for 'I have come to see that with the first founders of philosophy moral and religious questions occupy a much larger space in proportion to physical science than I and others besides me once supposed.' He still keeps the antithesis between the Chthonian and the Olympian deities, being more than ever assured of its rightness by the work of Miss Harrison; but he does not now, any more than in the first edition, agree with Miss Harrison in taking a depreciatory view of the Olympian deities. 'I still adhere to my original conviction that the best elements in Orphicism, or whatever else the reformed faith of the sixth century is to be called, were due to the elevating influence exercised by the more aristocratic and expansive on the more gloomy and puritanical theology. And it seems to me that both Heracleitus and the great Italiote philosophers together with Pindar and Æschylus were inspired more by the faiths of life and light than by the faiths of darkness and death.'

Mr. Benn thinks that the most original part of his book on the Greek Philosophers is his chapter on

the Sophists. He argued that the Sophists were not conservatives as Grote held, but revolutionists, and revolutionists for good. He retains that chapter and its argument, for Professor Chiapelli of Rome agrees with him, and he has 'been told that the late Professor D. G. Ritchie of St. Andrews used to recommend it warmly to his pupils.' He retains the chapter and defends the argument at some length in his new preface. 'To gain room for the numerous additions made in this edition, a chapter on "Greek Philosophy and Modern Thought" has been left out as not contributing anything of importance to the interpretation of the ancients whatever light it might throw on more modern speculations.'

Morning Rays for 1914 (Edinburgh: 72 Hanover Street), still edited by the Rev. Harry Smith, M.A., has still its ancient breadth and beauty.

The year's volume of *Life and Work*, the Church of Scotland Magazine and Mission Record, has appeared in its familiar bright red binding (Edinburgh: R. & R. Clark). It is surprising how little the magazine has changed in all the years of its issue. It is just as surprising how much. A magazine should be as a man. It should preserve its individuality so that we always may know it when we see it. But it should be making continual progress, forgetting the things that are behind and stretching forward to those that are before. So it is with *Life and Work*.

From the same publishers comes *The Church of Scotland Year-Book* for 1915.

With all the books which are written on Mysticism few of us know what the Mysticism of the Roman Catholic Church is. It is not that we have not tried to know. But we find it difficult to discover the right door of entrance. Let us try *An Introduction to the Mystical Life*, by Abbé P. Lejeune, which has been translated into English by Mr. Basil Levett (Washbourne; 3s. 6d. net). The book is deliberately written to give entrance not perhaps to Protestants in particular, but so plainly that Protestants may at least try it. To some it will mean a complete revolution in thought perhaps also in the conduct of life.

Arabic Christian Literature.

By Margaret D. Gibson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Cambridge.

III.

A Christian philosopher, named *'Abd al Messīh bin Isḥāc al Kindy*, at the court of Al-Mamoun at Baghdad about A.D. 830, wrote an apology for the Christian Faith. He is not to be confounded with the philosopher Al-Kindy, who lived at the same court in the previous century, and wrote a disquisition against the doctrine of the Trinity. The Apology of Al-Kindy has lately been published in Arabic by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and there is a translation of it by Sir William Muir. The Apology is written in reply to a courtier of the Hashimy clan (a branch of the Koreish) who had been urging the author, a hereditary Christian, to embrace the faith of Islâm. The author replies by expressing his opinion that most of the Moslems of his time had become so, in order to indulge in practices forbidden by Christianity; he declares that outward observances are vain, and that only purity of heart finds favour with God. He points out that the Corân is full of contradictions, and contrasts Mohammad's murderous methods with the gentle persuasiveness of Christ and His Apostles. He says, 'If God so willed, He might have forced all men into the Faith, but then the glory of Humanity which lies in Free-will would have gone.' Al-Kindy, who was a Nestorian, believed that miracles were still being wrought by means of relics, and he asks why Mohammad wrought none, and why he allowed Bishr to be poisoned by Zeinab's leg of mutton. He concludes with an earnest appeal to his friend to become a Christian, quoting the testimony of the Corân to Jesus in Sura, iii. *v.* 48.

Theodore Abu Ḳurra, Bishop of Ḥarrān,

about the end of the ninth century, was a pupil of St. John of Damascus. There are Syriac and Arabic MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris which contain his controversies with Muhammadans, one of them held before a son of Haroun al Raschîd. The earliest dated MS. in the British Museum (Cod. Or. 4950) contains a treatise by Abu Ḳurra in defence of Image-worship; it has been published by J. Arendzen. Perhaps Abu Ḳurra is likewise the author of a Defence of Christian Doctrines which forms the first part of the same codex, part of which has been edited by P. I. Malouf, S.J. A codex consisting of a number of treatises by Abu Ḳurra has lately been discovered by a monk named Constantine Basa, and was published at Beyrout in 1904.

Poetry and preaching were not, however, the only vehicles for the transmission of Christian ideas, nor had the Church any monopoly of Christian virtues. During the Caliphate, the court at Baghdad was adorned by a noble succession of Christian physicians. Of these the first was *Geourgees bin Buchtyesbo'*, who refused a present of female slaves from the Caliph Mansour.

The next was *Ḥonain bin Isḥāḳ* (A.D. 809–873), of whom the beautiful story is told, that the cruel Caliph Motawakkil requested him to tell of a drug by means of which he, the Caliph, could remove his enemies without the cause of their death being suspected; the doctor replied that he had learned only the art of curing, not that of killing. The Caliph ordered an executioner to enter with a sword and a leather mat, such as were usually employed on like occasions, but seeing that Ḥonain persisted in his refusal, turned off the matter with a laugh, and an assurance that it had been done merely to prove the fidelity of his physician. On the Caliph asking what had prevented Ḥonain from complying with his wishes, the latter replied that there were two obstacles, his religion, which inculcated the love of enemies, and his profession, which obliged him to give his fellow-creatures only what would do them good. Ḥonain wrote a treatise on the Fear of God, and another on the Quality of the Idea of the True Religion. He translated many medical works from Greek into Arabic, as did also his son *Isḥāḳ bin Honain*, A.D. 830–911, though of the latter we possess chiefly translations of philosophical works, such as Aristotle's. It is sad to relate that being excommunicated by his Bishop for his opinions on image-worship, he was untrue to the principles he had so bravely professed, by taking poison A.D. 873.

Ḥonain's nephew, *Ḥubaish*, assisted his uncle in translation, and his pupil, *Abu Bur Metta*, translated the poetry of Aristotle (D. S. Margoliouth, London, 1887).

Yaḥja bin Mâsoueehi was physician to Haroun al Raschid, and wrote many useful medical works. He was very witty, and to him is attributed the reply to a patient who wished to be excused from being bled on the ground that he was not accustomed to it, 'Neither are you accustomed to your malady.'

Thābit bin Qurrah, A.D. 836–902, was a physician at Baghdad, who wrote twenty books on philosophy and medicine, besides revising and improving the work of Ḥonain bin Isḥāḳ. He was so successful in the exercise of his profession, that a grateful poet Al Surri er Raffā, whose wife Thābit he had restored to health, wrote the following panegyric about him:

> Is there anyone can heal
> With such satisfying zeal
> Excepting only Allah, as our Doctor, son of Qurrah?
> A word from Thābit's tongue
> Can many a life prolong,
> And we think of Jesus, son of Mary, the Restorer.
> Diseases dark as night,
> Though hidden from our sight,
> Are all to Thābit clear as an image in a mere.

Al Saby (934–983) was a celebrated letter-writer and collector of letters; he also wrote a history of the Court at Baghdad. He remained a steadfast Christian, though sorely pressed to go over to Islâm.

To return to the Church. *Eutychius*, or *Said b. al Batrīq* (A.D. 876–940), Patriarch of Alexandria, wrote Annals extending from the Creation to his own time, which have been liberally drawn upon by many subsequent writers. An extract from his works, relating to the foundation of the Alexandrian Church, published by John Selden (London, 1642), led to a great controversy about the original equality of Bishops and Presbyters. His Annals have lately been published in *Corp. Script. Christ. Orient.*

He was speedily followed by Severus, Monophysite bishop of Ashmunain, whose writings are chiefly polemical. His History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria has been published by C. F. Seybold (Beyrout, 1904) from Brit. Mus. Or. 1477, a MS.

of the eighteenth century. He also wrote a History of the first four Councils as an apology for Monophysitism against the attacks of Eutychius, recently published in *Patrologia Orientalis*, the Council of Chalcedon being his chief bugbear, as well as a number of other theological works, some of which have not survived.

Yahya b. 'Adī, or Abu Zakarīja (893–974), a Jacobite physician, translated many philosophical books from the Syriac, his original works being on such subjects as the Trinity and the Incarnation. The chief one is an 'Apology for Christianity,' from a Monophysite standpoint. Many of them will be found in the Paris and Vatican libraries.

Cyriacus, who wrote against Abu Zakarija, should also be mentioned, as well as two pupils of the latter, *Abu Nasr Yahya b. Hariz* (*Harir*) and *Abu 'Ali Isa b. Ishāḳ*.

Abu 'l Ḥasan. b. Israil (eleventh century) was called 'the Christian Author.' Nothing else is known of him save that he was killed by the people of Nisibis.

Ibn al Talmeez (A.D. 1165) was famous as a doctor, as a Christian, and as an author of medical works.

Abu Raita Ḥabib b. Qadma, Jacobite Bishop of Takrīt (eleventh century) wrote some theological works. There are three letters of his in the Paris library, and some of his other writings are included in those of Yahya b. 'Adi.

Abu 'l Fath 'Abdallah b. al Faḍl, Metropolitan at Antioch, in the middle of the eleventh century, wrote translations of the Psalter from the LXX, of the Gospels, and of Homilies of Basil, Demetrius, Chrysostom, of the 'Dispute with Pyrrhus,' of St. Maximus, of a Collection of Canons, and of the works of John of Damascus and of Isaac Syrus. He also compiled the Kitāb Bahjat al Ma'mūn, a book of Questions and Answers on theological subjects, drawn from the works of Isaac Syrus and Chrysostom, about the Creation, Resurrection, etc., MSS. in *Vat.* and *Bodl.*

Bar Hebræus mentions Abu 'l Faraj b. al Tayyib, a Nestorian monk, who died in A.D. 1043, and who translated from the Syriac the philosophical works of Aristotle and the medical works of Galen, and who also wrote commentaries on both Testaments in four books.[1] He was secretary to the Patriarchate, but under which Patriarch is uncertain. Bar Hebræus says that he spent twenty years on a commentary and that his zeal for it killed him. His works are to be found in the libraries at the Vatican, at Milan, Paris, Lugd. (Bat.), and the British Museum. *Ibn Abradi*, his pupil, wrote a 'Book of Guidance,' and a medical work, both of which are in the Paris Library.

Elias of Nisibis, or *Bar-Shinaya* (975–1049), Nestorian Metropolitan, wrote both in Arabic and Syriac. His chief work is a chronicle up to A.D. 1008, in parallel columns (Syriac and Arabic), the latter being in a vulgar idiom. The MS. is in the British Museum, and is probably an autograph. Part of it has been published by De Lamy, part by Baethgen. His other writings are theological, in defence of the doctrine of the Trinity against the Moslems, of the Divinity of Christ against the Jews, and of the Nestorian faith against Cyril and Severus of Ashmunain. His language is sometimes rather violent.

Two works current throughout the East are attributed to Elias. One, the *Book of the Seven Sessions*, is a letter relating that the vizier Abu' l Quasim Husein, being ill while on a journey, was cured by a monk in the cloister of Mar Marin, and thinking his cure to be miraculous, he visited Elias b. Sina, in A.D. 1026, to inquire further about the Christian faith. After holding seven sessions together, the Metropolitan succeeded in convincing the vizier that there is really no difference between Nestorian and Moslem doctrine, except only the question of Muhammad's divine commission. The letter giving an account of these seven sessions bears the imprimatur of Abu 'l Faraj b. al Tayyib, as secretary to the Patriarch. There are MSS. of it at the Vatican, at Paris, Berlin, the Brit. Mus., Beyrout, and Milan.

The other work is called *Kitāb fi muân dafâ l hamm*, 'Book of Helps against Sorrow.' Some MSS. give Elias Ibn Sina as the author, but one gives Bar Hebræus. There are MSS. in the Vatican, Borgian, Paris, Brit. Mus., Bodleian, and at Gotha.

Elias III., Patriarch at Baghdad (b. 1128, d. 1190), was celebrated for his linguistic knowledge, and translated many works into Arabic. He wrote in a fluent and exquisite style a Book of Consolations, or Funeral Speeches, much used in our own day, even by Muhammadans. It has been recently reprinted at Mosul.

We now come to *Abu 'l Faraj Gregorius*, also

[1] He probably translated Tatian's *Diatessaron* from Syriac into Arabic.

called *Bar Hebræus* (A.D. 1226–1286), who was renowned as a physician, philosopher, historian, poet, and commentator. He was born at Malatia, of Jewish parentage, and became in succession Bishop of Gubas, Lakabhin, and Aleppo. He belonged to the Jacobite branch of the Syrian Church, and most of his works are written in that language. They embrace treatises on every branch of human knowledge understood in his day. He must be included in our list of Arabic writers, as his *History of the Dynasties* was written by himself in Arabic, as well as in Syriac. It is distinguished by a clear and charming style, and has been published by Pococke (Oxford, 1663) and Salhani (Beyrout, 1890).

Among modern authors we may mention Bishop *Germanus Farḥât the Maronite*, a grammarian, and his contemporary, the priest *Nicolaus es-Sâiegh*, whose poems were written in Syrian monasteries between 1722 and 1756: these are chiefly in praise of the Virgin and her Son, and of the Roman Church; *Rizq Allahi Hassoun*, a collector of fables (London, 1867); *Iskander Agha*, who wrote a book called *Tazyin Nehâieh al 'Arab* (Beyrout, 1867); and *Jûsuf Elias ed-Dibs*, author of a book called *Murby es-Sirâr wa Murby al Kibâr* (Beyrout, 1879), in a good style and with truly Christian feeling.

One of the most learned authors of the end of last century was *Boutros al-Bustâny*, who compiled a large cyclopædia in volumes, containing information on scientific, historical, and geographical subjects, not only Eastern but Western. He published four or five parts. His sons carried it on to the letter س, where they stopped. The articles have headings in European type, which makes the work easier for European scholars to consult (Beyrout, 1876, Cairo, 1900). Bustâny also wrote a great dictionary, an Arabic grammar, and a treatise on Arabic literature.

Dr. Van Dyck, the American Orientalist, published an Arabic grammar and a most useful work on Astronomy, with attractive plates (Beyrout, 1874), and many other educational works.

An Arab of the Arabs, uncontaminated by Western ideas, and a man of astonishing genius and subtlety of mind, was *Nasîf al Yâzijy*, who lived and wrote at Beyrout in the middle of last century. He was a lexicographer and a poet, and his poetry is greatly indebted to his lexicography, for his principal work, *Kitâb majma' al Baḥrain* (Beyrout, 1850), takes the literary form of *Maḳâmat*, or narratives, of which the hero, Maimoun al Hazamy, introduces himself thus:

> Hazamy I, of Arab race,
> To paths of men I turn my face,
> From serious things get laughter loud,
> And waters from the thunder-cloud.
> My claws are veiled with gauntlets neat,
> With tender wand the spear I meet,
> At youthful sages poke my fun,
> Like Amrou, M'ady Karib's son.
> My armour is of grammar-lore,
> Through which no sword-thrusts ever bore.
>
> I have a tongue whose crafty guile
> The lion from his lair can wile.
> And if the truth should cause surprise,
> I take a refuge oft in lies,
> For so my Father did advise.

And it deals much in riddles and feats of word-play, such as collections of synonyms in verse, and lines that one can read forwards or backwards with the same sense either way.

The latest enterprise in Arabic Christian Literature which we shall mention is *Al Muqtataf*, an Arabic scientific review, published monthly at Cairo, under the editorship of Dr. Y. Sarruf and Dr. F. Nimr; also a similar one, called *Al Mashriq*, printed at Beyrout.

See Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, i. pp. 28–30; Cheikho, *Les Poètes Arabes Chrétiens*; Graf, *Die Christlich-arabische Litteratur bis zur Frankischen Zeit*.

Contributions and Comments.

Is not Fighting incompatible with the Teaching of Jesus Christ?

An initial source of mistake arises from starting from the teaching of Christ and asking if this teaching is not applicable to nations as well as to individuals. Bernhardi does this, and answers clearly, 'It is not.' So I think did the late Bishop of Peterborough, Dr. Magee, when he said that no nation could guide its policy by the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount.

Now it is almost a commonplace to say that Christ aimed not so much at giving precepts, as at creating a spirit like His own in individual men. But this commonplace is as often forgotten as remembered. If I attempt to define this spirit, I find it in the primary features of our Lord's earthly life:

An abiding sense of the presence of God;
An absolute confidence in His love and power;
And a tireless willingness to serve His fellow-men.

This, I think, is what He means by 'Life' or 'Eternal Life' as the gift of God to men through Himself. His teaching takes a secondary place, and was never methodical or systematic, not the unfolding of a system, but rather stimulative and even paradoxical. We must not, therefore, argue out a code of duties from His maxims, but, desiring to be guided by His spirit in order that we may know our duty, try to find out what light the maxims throw upon it.

I hesitate to give examples which are already familiar; but a comparison of Mt 12^{30} with Mk 9^{40} shows how He gave prominence at different times to different ideas. Again, every one recognizes that 'Give to him that asketh of thee, etc.,' is intended to inculcate the generous attitude towards the needy, but does not bind us to give money to stalwart beggars or to lend it to rogues. There are two attitudes of mind possible when the beggar appears; and the Christian must start to decide his course of action, not from the selfish point of view, but from the generous one. Similar considerations apply to the non-resistance maxim. Christ Himself did not apply it to the case of a 'brother' offending, and we are justified in saying that it indicates the Christian attitude to wrong-doers, but is not a universal prescription for their treatment.

Our Lord desired to regenerate the world by regenerating individuals. About this He was intensely in earnest. Of far-reaching views on social, political, or ecclesiastical organization, He gives no indication. The Kingdom will not come by external organization, but when men have really learnt of Him, then 'wars will be no more,' for the nations will be full of the spirit that possesses the constituent individuals. From this the reader may see that I am quite prepared to grant that war is un-Christian.

But as yet the 'lump' is 'unleavened.' The leaven is nevertheless at work. It makes some impression, and even in the national sphere you may trace its action in the anxiety of both sides in this war to prove that they are acting on the highest principles. The Germans do not put forward, when they want to win the good opinion of America, the principles of the Bernhardi School—that war is the great National good, that France must be 'bled white,' and England crushed, in order that Germany may give the blessings of her 'Civilization' to a world in which she has no possible rival. On the contrary, they love peace, but have been treacherously attacked by a hostile coalition of envious Powers, they are being stabbed in the back by England, and so forth. This seems to me to show the working of a conscience that cannot ignore the Christian Ideal. Nevertheless it is not unfair to say that neither the masses of the Christian nations, nor, therefore, the States themselves, are fully christianized.

What, then, is a Christian to do? A somewhat similar question presented itself in the wild, disorderly, and evil days of the early Middle Ages, and Monasticism offered itself as an answer. Without underrating the services of Monasticism to Religion and Civilization, I think experience showed that this answer was a mistaken one. To remove the choicest leaven from the lump—I assume for argument's sake that the monks were all good—was not the way to leaven the lump.

And now consider the Christian who will take no part in the war, on the ground that it is un-Christian, that is, that it would be impossible in a fully Christian world. I will assume that he

admits that this is a war against a great injustice, against a Power that has kept all Europe in anxiety for years by its ever-swelling armaments, and by the open acceptance of the teaching of the Bernhardi School—is not such a Christian adopting a line very like St. Benedict's? He is removing his Christian influence and spirit from a sphere in which it can work, in which it can and will infect his fellow-men, to a quiet backwater where he can cherish his ideals, but where they are comparatively powerless for good. Where but in the actual world, with all its evil, can we be its 'salt' and 'light'?

I do feel the attractiveness of the national 'turning of the other cheek.' But only a nation Christian to a man could do it. It would be contrary to Christian principle to coerce a minority into such a course. But what if the cheek struck be not my own but a Frenchman's or a Belgian's? Our Lord did not resent injuries to Himself; but did any one express resentment more terribly than He did against the Scribes and Pharisees for the wrongs they did to others? And did He not use actual force against those who defiled his Father's house? If I saw a ruffian maltreating a child, and felled him to the ground, should I have to fear His condemnation?

There I must leave it, not, I confess, with the joyous confidence of some in the good that is to come of it all. It grieves me that—

> His pale face on the cross sees only this
> After the Passion of two thousand years.

I fear success in war only less than failure. It is blind optimism to fancy that a nation is necessarily purified permanently by war. Germany, to go no further afield, has deteriorated since 1871. I pray we may not be spoiled but bettered by the victory to which I look forward with confidence. But in the world in which our lot has been cast, I feel that we must take our part, though doing so makes us realize how far off yet is the Kingdom of God.

R. Somervell.

Harrow-on-the-Hill.

Lewisian and Curetonian Versions of the Gospels.

In our preceding article we stated that a certain *rapprochement* may safely be assumed to exist between the Lewisian and the Diatessaron, notwithstanding the influence of the Peshitta that the latter text had surely undergone. The present article claims to lay stress upon the relation of both Versions, and to examine, as a conclusion, the question of the original language in which Tatian wrote his Harmony. Those who think that the coincidences between L and D may be explained by a dependence of the former on the latter, will have to face the following objections:—

1. It is scarcely conceivable that the Syriac translator of L, who was rendering faithfully the original text, would have looked, for the translation of every word, how and where this word was used by Tatian in a quite independent work in which, at the present day, notwithstanding all the synchronal and mnemonic tables exhibited by its editors, we feel a great difficulty in finding the verse that we want. What utility did this translator experience in perusing a book presented in a shape contrary to that he intended to offer to posterity? If this translator had considered the Diatessaron as an orthodox lucubration worthy of his attention, why did he omit all the apocryphal and mutilated verses that Tatian had accepted as authentic?

2. 'Why is the angel of Bethesda presumably absent from the Sinai text, though found in the Diatessaron? and why is the order of the story in Jn 18^{12-25}, as it stands in the Sinai text, so far superior from a literary point of view to that of the Greek manuscript? The translator cannot have got that from the Diatessaron.'[1]

3. Finally, if the Lewisian Version has been influenced by the Diatessaron, why are the final verses of the Gospel of St. Mark, though found in the Diatessaron, missing in the Lewisian? This argument may have special consideration on account of the title 'The Lord Jesus' which is bestowed in these verses upon the Christ, a title which, as everybody is well aware, is very frequently used in the Lewisian text instead of the less Christian 'Jesus.'

In conclusion, we can infer from what has been stated above that it is within the limits of probability to believe that Tatian has known and freely used the Lewisian.

As to the second part of this short study, namely, the original language in which Tatian wrote his

[1] A. S. Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels*, 1910, p. v of the Introduction.

Harmony, we can presumably accentuate more and more the Semitic hypothesis of its first composition.

A general and negative argument may be raised in favour of a Syriac origin from the fact (*a*) that those who hold the opposite opinion of a Greek origin for the Harmony do not pretend to present any positive reason for the confirmation of their hypothesis, but content themselves with a theoretical view of the question; (*b*) that, so far as we are able to judge to-day, Tatian's Harmony did not obtain in the Hellenic circles even a shadow of the honour that it possessed in the Syriac-speaking communities, and that apart from a mere historical mention no author spoke of the Diatessaron as being in use in any religious bodies living on the Western Mediterranean shores. Therefore, *in dubio melior est conditio possidentis.*

The following statements claim to prove that a Semitic origin of Tatian's work does not rest merely on a speculative sphere or a negative reasoning:—

1. We have already noticed that in Mt 3^4 the word 'wild' is rendered in the Diatessaron by the expression 'of the mountains.' We have a difficulty in believing that Tatian, a Mesopotamian writer, would ever have used the Eastern and Syrian locution 'of the mountains' to express simply 'wild' if (*a*) he had written in Greek, and if (*b*) he had not used the Lewisian.

2. The quotations from the Diatessaron found in Syriac authors of a later date do not seem to have in their wording any Hellenic savour. On the contrary, everything appears to point to a Syriac composition. The apocryphal sentence which is used about the baptism of our Lord, and to which we drew attention in our preceding article, is, I think, of great weight for our surmise.

3. Moreover, there are in the Diatessaron, as known by the Arabic edition of Ciasca, some expressions which are certainly Semitic, with which Hellenism has nothing to do. Those who devote themselves to Oriental learning know that the Semites employ the *noun of action* and the *Mimmed infinitive* derived from the verb, immediately after this verb, in order to accentuate the idea expressed by the sentence, *ex. gr.* 'thou shalt die (the) death.' Theologians who, in studying the Semitic mind and the Semitic way of expression, unfortunately draw exclusively from the poor Hebraic language instead of mixing their Hebrew knowledge with a necessary reading of some other Semitic tongue, will find such philological features almost in every page of the Hebrew Bible. This syntactic fact, which is in some cases a real touch-stone for a Semitic expression, is found sometimes in the Diatessaron. We may see, for instance, how the phrase of Mt 6^2: 'When thou doest alms,' is rendered by the Semitism *Ṣadaḳta biṣadaḳatin* which is not found in the other Syriac Versions translated from the Greek.

Here we invite our readers to examine an interesting article of Dr. Rendel Harris in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (May 1914), about a text of St. Ephrem on Mt 15^{1-12}. On the hypothesis of Ephrem certainly using the Diatessaron, and in the case of such an addition being inserted by Tatian from the Old Testament to the genuine narrative of the evangelist, the commentary of the famous Syrian Father would suggest the idea that Tatian was quoting from the Syriac of the Old Testament Peshiṭta, and that consequently he was very probably writing in Syriac.

A. MINGANA.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

Boanerges.

IN order to prove that *βοανεργες* represents the north Palestinian pronunciation of the Aramaic בנירגיש, J. Courtenay James in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xxvi. p. 45, gives four arguments.

1. In Galilee, he says, the vowel sounds were very broadly and inaccurately enunciated. This argument is too general to prove anything. It ought to be supported by concrete instances.

2. In the Greek transliteration of רְחוֹבוֹת the *sheva* sounds like *o*, says James, for LXX (written in Egypt, not in Galilee!) has *ροωβωθ*. This argument is in no way convincing. Compare סְדֹם = *σοδομ* and עֲמֹרָה = *γομορρα*. In both cases the *sheva* is represented by *o*, not because it sounds like *o*, but because it is followed by *o*. This is what we call '*regressive Vocalassimilation.*'

3. That this is so, is demonstrated by *ραβια* = רְחַבְיָה. For *ραβια* is either a mistake in writing or a contraction of *ρααβια*. According to the theory of James, the form ought to be *ροαβια*. But from this form the evolution to *ραβια* is not possible to expound.

4. רְחַבְעָם = *ροβοαμ* is intelligible only by suppos-

ing that LXX has read רְחֹבָעָם. In this case there is '*regressive Vocalassimilation*' again.

5. In the stead of תַּלְמֵי we find θαλμαι, θολμαι, θαλμι, θολμι, θαλαμαι, θολαμαι, θελαμι, and, most welcomed by James, θοαλμαι. This form is said to represent the *sheva* by the juxtaposition of the two vowels *o* and *a*. But here *oa* is not the equivalent of a *sheva*, and the form, most striking among the other types, is hardly original. I think θοαλμαι is nothing but a mistake for θολαμαι. Write the two forms in uncials, and you will see it clearly. Thus from the interesting arguments which James offers not one proves to be convincing.

The not very important but most difficult enigma of βοανεργες is therefore not yet solved.

PROF. DR. LUDWIG KOEHLER.

Langnau-Zurich.

The Eagle and her Young.

IN the 'Notes of Recent Exposition' for December you describe how Dr. Peters has searched the Continents for evidence of the accuracy of the description of the eagle's 'stirring up' her nest in Dt $32^{11f.}$. He could have found a better instance than any named in the 'Notes' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES itself—vol. xx. p. 136.

C. RYDER SMITH.

Wolverhampton.

Amos iii. 3–8.

THE connexion of ideas in these verses is regarded as being not very clear, especially after v.5, and various propositions of transposition have been made and also emendations suggested (see commentaries, especially Nowack, 'Handkommentar zum Alten Testament,' *Die kleinen Propheten*, 2nd ed., p. 137 f.).

I think that this passage has to be explained in the following way. Vv.3-6 contain the examples of cause and effect. The inference to be drawn from the examples mentioned is that the prophesying of the prophet is also the effect of a cause, and that cause is the command of God. This inference is not stated in the text, but follows *ipso facto* from what was said in vv.3-6. Then the prophet explains (by the way) in v.7 that God has always revealed His intentions to the prophets. V.7 thus presupposes the inference just stated. After v.7 one must assume the possibility of one asking why the prophet must bear the message given to him to the people concerned. To this hypothetical question v.8 supplies the answer: the prophet must prophesy when God commands him to do so. The real theme of this passage is therefore to be found in vv.3-6 and in the inference to be supplemented after v.6. Vv.7-8 are additional observations of the prophet which are not vital to the subject.

The whole passage is thus fully explained. The main point to be kept in mind is that the application following on vv.3-6 is not stated in the text, but must be supplemented mentally after v.6

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

Amos ix. 13.

'Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed.'

DRIVER ('Camb. Bible') comments: 'A hyperbolical description of the fertility of the soil. So rapid will be the growth of the crops, that the ploughman will hardly have finished breaking up the ground for seed, when the corn will be ready for the reaper.' There are two objections to this comment: (1) Such rapidity of growth is too violently hyperbolical. (2) It gives us the reaper overtaking the ploughman, rather than *vice versa*.

Here, in South China, we sometimes see reapers and ploughmen at work on the same field, the reapers cutting the corn with their sickles and beating it out into a tub, and then, when the reapers have made a beginning, the plough is set to work on the part of the field already reaped. If the crop is a heavy one, it is easy to conceive that the ploughman gets over the ground more quickly than the reaper can finish his task, and so overtakes him.

This interpretation—if it suits the facts in Palestine as it does the facts here—lays stress not on the rapidity of the corn's growth, but on the abundance of the harvest, and so gives us a better parallel both to the next clause and to Lv 26^{5}.

P. J. MACLAGAN.

Swatow.

'House.'

Why does the tenth commandment appear to omit children, the most sorely coveted possession of all (from the Eastern point of view at any rate)? In the light of Gn 16^6 30^1, 1 S 1^6, the temptation was obviously strong. I suggest that 'house' is the equivalent of 'family' here, as in Gn 12^{17} 50^{22}, Ex 16^{31} 19^3 40^{38}, 2 S 7^{11}, among many passages which might be cited. Does this account for the precedence of 'house' over 'wife' in Ex 20^{17} (but see LXX order which = Dt 5^{21})? The notion may seem fanciful, but it seems to me improbable that in a land where sterility was regarded as a blight from heaven, a man's dwelling-place should be inserted and his family omitted. It seems doubtful whether a dwelling would be a common cause of envy, especially so early.

Harrington C. Lees.

Beckenham.

Entre Nous.

The offer is made of a complete set (20 vols.) of *The Great Texts of the Bible* (or the equivalent in other books chosen from T. & T. Clark's Catalogue) for the best series of illustrations from the War, suitable for pulpit or platform. The illustrations should be sent in February.

The illustrations need not be copied out. Papers, periodicals, or clippings may be sent. But the topic or text illustrated should be clearly marked. Stamps should be sent for return if desired.

Poetry.

John Mason Neale.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have issued a complete edition of the Hymns, original and translated, of John Mason Neale. The title is *Collected Hymns, Sequences and Carols* (6s. net). Another volume will be issued containing the poems. The editorial introduction is signed by Dr. Neale's daughter, Mary Sackville Lawson, to whom we must attribute the labour and success of this most necessary undertaking, though she speaks as if others had been associated with her. The collection makes a closely printed crown octavo volume of 460 pages. In some ways the most interesting part of that volume is the part containing 'Hymns for Children,' in which Dr. Neale attempted, very unsuccessfully, 'to free our poor children from the yoke of Watts.'

Arthur Edward Waite.

That sometimes illuminating, often perplexing, but always striking writer on Mysticism, Mr. Arthur Edward Waite, is also a poet. And his poetry is more than his prose. Whether it is something in poetry itself or in him, there is less to perplex and more to please in his poems than in any or all of his prose writings. His volumes of poetry are these: *Strange Houses of Sleep* (1906); *A Book of Mystery and Vision* (1902); *Lucasta: Parables and Poems* (1889); *A Soul's Comedy* (1887); *Israfel* (1886, 1894).

The poetry in these books has all been collected now into two very handsome volumes and published under the title of *The Collected Poems of Arthur Edward Waite* (Rider; 2 vols., 21s. net).

Each volume has its contents most elaborately described. The description is nothing less than an interpretation of the poem. Sometimes it goes beyond interpretation and becomes a little homily of its own on the subject of the poem. For example, on 'Wings of Fire' this is given in the contents: 'The sacramental life of Nature is often so encouraging in its aspects, that we are inclined to regard it as the only veil which separates us from the Divine. And yet there are other of its aspects which hint at unknown forms of sacramentalism behind it, some of which interpenetrate our own, at least intermittently. There are indications also of the interference of lower sacramental orders quite distinct from the presence of moral evil in the world. While it is the soul's end to rise above all the cosmic systems, it may be doubted whether this is attainable except through the pomp and adornment of several sacramental lives. What follows is therefore the expression of the soul's desire to be dissolved. Things that look near are sometimes very far

away—as in the tropics of the physical world, so in certain torrid zones of supersensual thought.'

We shall not attempt to analyze Mr. Waite's gift. For many reasons it will be better to follow our usual method and offer two of the poems for consideration:

WITNESSES OF SILENCE.

Man's heart is for himself a volume writ
In cipher, having no true key to it;
And other hearts discourse on every side
Language, to which no lips have e'er replied.

Then

OF SLEEPING AND WAKING.

That virgin peer who sought the Holy Grail
Found in the castle hall his senses fail,
By heavy slumber strangely overweigh'd.
The pomp, through smoke of censers slowly sway'd,
Swept by him, prone with limbs that never stirr'd
And lips that moved not with the questing word,
Which would the hidden mystery reveal
And the King's hurts and all the country heal.
Therefrom the woe wax'd greater, more and more.
So also we, who our sad state deplore,
Of hidden oracle and holy lips
Ask secret lights, the passwords and the grips;
But when the vision from the veil replies
Sleep falls full heavy on our souls and eyes,
And, whatsoe'er is spoken or withheld,
It utters nothing to our senses spell'd.
O Knight of Arthur's court, after great stress
You saw the hallows which could heal and bless:
May we in time our long enchantment break
And to the word of life from sleep awake!

G. K. Chesterton.

Messrs. Dent have issued a fourth edition of *The Wild Knight*, by Mr. G. K. Chesterton (3s. 6d. net). They have issued it in most attractive form; and they have had the privilege of adding new poems to this edition. We may quote one poem; we think it is characteristic:

GOOD NEWS.

Between a meadow and a cloud that sped
In rain and twilight, in desire and fear,
I heard a secret—hearken in your ear,
'Behold the daisy has a ring of red.'

That hour, with half of blessing, half of ban,
A great voice went through heaven and earth and hell,
Crying, 'We are tricked, my great ones, is it well?
Now is the secret stolen by a man.'

Then waxed I like the wind because of this,
And ran, like gospel and apocalypse,
From door to door, with new anarchic lips,
Crying the very blasphemy of bliss.

In the last wreck of Nature, dark and dread,
Shall in eclipse's hideous hieroglyph,
One wild form reel on the last rocking cliff,
And shout, 'The daisy has a ring of red.'

E. J. Thompson.

Mr. Edward J. Thompson is not known as Mr. Chesterton is. But he also is a poet. Most of the poems in *Ennerdale Bridge, and other Poems* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net) have India for atmosphere. But they do not depend on locality, they are of the mind which Milton tells us is its own place always. This poem has another atmosphere than that of India:

CANA.

The wine ran out, the bearer's warning glance
Answered the bride's inquiring countenance.
To Mary's heart there came
Sorrow lest envious tongues the feast profane,
And scalding tears of shame
Fill up and stain
Another woman's eyes, to bear the blame
Of poverty that from its lavished store
Showed naked now and could provide no more.
One word that mother spake,
Enough—behold the sleeping virtue wake
Within the Son! Behold those pots arow
And brimmed with ruddy glow!
Hear the Feastmaster's voice, rejoiced, amazed,
In generous chiding towards the bridegroom raised:
'Men give the good wine first, then why hast thou
Kept the best wine till now?'

Even thus, even thus indeed,
Thou dost prevent our need,
Quickening, by looks divine,
Life's simple pleasures to a richer shine.
Yet more than this transfigured water, Lord,
Thy presence at the board.

R. L. Gales.

Mr. R. L. Gales writes his poems on familiar topics, but the treatment is all his own. The poem which gives its name to the volume *David in Heaven* (Simpkin; 3s. 6d. net) is daring in conception but charming in execution:

> David leads the countless quire
> Where the singers never tire,
> Larks that sing the whole day thro'
> In the immeasurable blue;
> Cherubim and seraphim
> In the tumult of their hymn
> Are as winds that fan the fire.

That is one verse. But the book will be appreciated better by the quotation of this shorter poem:

BONUS LATRO.

They took him from his robber-cave
To die on Calvary;
The wise ones of the world were blind,
But the Good Thief could see.

They set him by the Lamb of God,
He felt an awe-struck fear;
The great ones of the earth were deaf,
But the Good Thief could hear.

Around him surged the crowd that mocked,
On the hillside that day;
The righteous men at best were dumb,
But the Good Thief could pray.

He went to take his due reward
When his day's work was done;
The godly men had played and lost,
But the Good Thief had won.

> In my death's hour, when it may be,
> Bone Latro, pray for me.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. W. S. Peebles, Annan.

Illustrations for the Great Text for March must be received by the 20th of January. The text is Ro $7^{24.25}$.

The Great Text for April is Ac 26^{28}—'And Agrippa said unto Paul, With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian.' A copy of Law's *The Tests of Life*, or of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, and Shaw's *Christianity as Religion and Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for May is Ph 2^{5-8}—'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of Lithgow's *The Parabolic Gospel*, and Coats's *The Christian Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for June is Ph 2^{9-11}—'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is a rare experience with us now to feel surprise. With the early disciples it was frequent, and must have been extremely pleasant. It is to the surprises of his life that St. Paul refers when he uses the word 'mystery.'

A mystery is with him something that was unknown till Christ came. Then it flashed upon men's minds with irresistible clearness and all the joy of a discovery. It is usually either the discovery of some excellence in Christ Himself, or else the certainty of some excellence yet to be discovered in His followers. In the Epistle to the Colossians (1^{27}) there is an admirable example of the latter use. The Apostle speaks, with evident surprise, and as evident pleasure, of 'this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.'

He is writing to Gentiles, and he addresses them directly. The mystery, he says, the discovery about the Gentiles which has just been made, the surprising thing about you Gentiles which has been suddenly brought to light, is that Christ in you is your hope of glory.

Now there is no great word of which we have lost the use so entirely as this word 'glory.' We never employ it in conversation, we seem to have no occasion to employ it. We never come across it in our reading, unless it be in a rare poetical phrase, such as the glory of the sunset. We do not hear it even from the pulpit except in the quotation of some text of the Bible.

And yet it is a very great word. In the Bible it is used with remarkable frequency and apparently in a vast variety of meanings. 'Nevertheless,' as the author of the article in the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels says, 'the underlying thought is simpler than would appear.' And he adds, 'The glory of God is His essential and unchanging Godhead as revealed to man.' It is not the glory of God that we have to do with at present, it is the glory of man; but that definition gives us an excellent opening. When we understand the glory of God, we shall understand the glory of man.

Now mark the words 'as revealed' in the definition of glory which has just been quoted. The glory of God is His nature *when it is seen*. Our Lord speaks of 'the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory' (Mt 24^{30}). When He was upon the earth His essential nature was not known. He greatly desired that it should be known, for in that lay all the hope for men. And so He prayed the Father, and said, 'Glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the

world was.' And He knew that the day was coming when it would be known—when, as He said, He would come on the clouds with power and great glory.

What is the character of God? It is goodness. We must not hesitate to use that word. We have not altogether lost the use of it yet, as we have lost the use of 'glory.' And we must not lose it. It is the very word that God Himself used when He spoke to Moses. Moses said, 'Shew me, I pray thee, thy glory.' And God answered, 'I will make all my goodness pass before thee' (Ex $33^{18.19}$). His goodness is His essential nature, and when His goodness is *seen*, that is His glory.

We may see His goodness in many ways. We may see it in the earth, if we have eyes to see. When Isaiah had his vision of God's holiness, he was told that it does not require a supernatural event to see the holiness, which is another name for the goodness, of God. The Seraphim sang their song of adoration, and said, 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the fulness of the whole earth is his glory.' Our English versions translate the words of the Seraphim, 'The whole earth is full of his glory,' which is quite true, but not an accurate translation. And the accurate translation is better: 'The fulness of the whole earth is his glory.' For this earth of ours is a world on which He has lavished the riches of His nature. It is a full earth. At the return of every season we scatter a few seeds on the soil of it, and it brings forth 'some an hundred fold.' Test its inexhaustibleness, He seems to say. It is full of the goodness of God. And when you see how full it is, you see the glory of God. Its fulness is His glory.

Do you remember the very first occasion on which the glory of the Lord is spoken of in the Bible? It is when the Israelites, on their way through that great and terrible wilderness, complained that they had not food enough. 'And Moses and Aaron said unto all the children of Israel, At even, then ye shall know that the Lord hath brought you out from the land of Egypt: and in the morning, then ye shall see the glory of the Lord' (Ex 16^{6}). Well, what happened in the morning? In the morning the people rose betimes, and looked out, and behold upon the face of the wilderness lay a small round thing, small as the hoar frost on the ground. It was the manna.

Where had it come from? Some say it came from a small creeping plant that maintains a precarious existence in that very wilderness, or did so once, and that there was no miracle about it. But what do they mean by a miracle? If it was 'an edible lichen,' and if the same edible lichen is found in Arabia to this day, what then? The fulness of the whole earth is His glory. On that morning, and not before, the Israelites saw how possible it was for God, and how easy, to say to the earth, Give forth some of thy fulness that they may see how good I am. And the earth gave forth of its fulness in the form of 'a small edible lichen,' till all the Israelites ate and were filled.

And one day a great company of the descendants of those Israelites were gathered in another desert place, listening to the wonderful words of the Son of God. The day wore away as they listened and wondered. When evening was at hand His disciples would have sent them away that they might go into the villages and buy themselves bread, 'for we are here in a desert place.' But He said, 'Give ye them to eat.' And very soon they were all satisfying themselves with bread, five hundred of them, besides women and children, as they sat in batches, like beds of flowers, among the green grass. Where had the bread come from? It came from 'the fulness of the earth.' The five loaves which they had were capable in His hands of being turned into as many loaves as were needed, to the great joy and satisfaction of that astonished multitude, just as the 'precious seed' which the sower goes forth with in the spring-time becomes in the autumn great sheaves of joy and thankfulness. And they who had eyes to see said afterwards,

'We beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father.'

But the fulness of the whole earth covers other things besides loaves of bread. When God promised to make all His goodness pass before Moses, and thus show him His glory, He added, 'And I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy.' Grace and mercy belong to God's goodness, and when we come upon Him in the exercise of them we see His glory.

Now we come upon God in the exercise of grace and mercy best of all in the Cross of Jesus Christ. For that Cross is His mercy and His grace in active evident exercise. Or, to take mercy and grace and express them in one word, we find in the Cross of Christ the activity of God's self-sacrificing love. We do not reach the height of the glory of God till we have reached the love of God. Is not this His nature? 'God is love.' Let us not drop goodness, but let us see to it that goodness takes exercise to keep itself warm. Let us say that the goodness of God is the love of God; and when we find the loving goodness of God going forth to men in the Cross of Christ, let us say, with the joyful surprise of the early disciples, 'We beheld his glory.'

We have taken all this time to discover the meaning of St. Paul's word 'glory.' We have gone to some passages of the Bible to see what is meant by the glory of God. But it is not of the glory of God that the Apostle is speaking when he writes to the Colossians and says, 'This mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.' It is of the glory of the Colossians themselves.

For the Apostle Paul is not afraid to speak of the glory of the Colossians. He is not afraid to call them 'saints,' and why should he be afraid to speak of their glory? What he tells them is that their goodness is so manifest—or will yet be so manifest—that it will be spoken of as their glory, just as the goodness of God, when it is seen, is called the glory of God.

It is true he only says, 'Christ in you, the *hope* of glory.' But what does St. Paul mean by hope? Does he mean what we mean when we say, 'I hope so'? He speaks of hope—or if it is not he, it is another speaking very like him, and he would certainly agree—the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of hope as 'an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast.' Is that 'I hope so'? Ask a fisherman as he lets down the anchor if it will hold. Does he answer, 'I hope so'? He knows it will hold, if there is anything for it to hold by. Now there is something to hold by here, something that never failed, as we shall see in a moment. And so the same writer speaks also of 'the full assurance of hope.'

The truth is, that the hope of the New Testament is as sure as faith or love. The only difference is that it looks towards the future. 'He that hath this hope in him purifieth himself.' What worth for purifying has 'I hope so'? St. Pau tells the Colossians that their goodness will yet be so real and so visible that it will assuredly be their glory.

He may well be surprised, and so may the Colossians, or any other Gentiles. As a Jew he had formerly had no opinion of Gentiles like the Colossians. And he had reason. It was not Jewish exclusiveness entirely. It was also Gentile badness. The Colossians and other Gentiles were scarcely any better than they were called. This very man gives us a list of their vices, and it is most unpleasant reading. Yet he does not hesitate to say that they will give up these vices and take on virtues in their place—and so heartily that their glory, the visible evidence of their goodness, is perfectly certain. It is so certain that he calls them saints already.

Now there never was a man less likely to in-

dulge in flattery than the Apostle Paul. He was an experimental preacher. He searched the heart and conscience—first his own and then his hearers'. If he has the certainty of attaining to a goodness which can be called glory, if he says that these Colossians have it, he has good reason for his confidence. What reason has he?

His reason is 'Christ in you.' Is it not enough? It is everything. And because it is everything, or out of it everything comes, he bows his knees unto the God and Father of his Lord Jesus Christ on behalf of the Colossians and the Ephesians and all other Gentiles everywhere, that Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith. For without that they are Gentiles tossed to and fro, without God and without hope in the world. With that they are 'fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.'

He was an experimental preacher. He preached out of his own experience. Telling the story of his first great surprise, as he was very fond of doing, he says, 'It pleased God to reveal his Son in me.' It was not that he learned all about Christ's life on earth. It was not that he had the resurrection on the third day proved to his mental satisfaction. You cannot prove a resurrection *in* one. It was that his heart was touched; his inner life was awakened. He saw the glory of God in the stricken face of Jesus Christ. And receiving Christ into his heart by faith, he knew that he, the chief of sinners, would yet gain a goodness that would be seen and read of all men and that would deserve to be spoken of as the glory of Paul, just as men speak of the glory of God.

What is a miracle? Not a year passes without some change taking place, not merely in our method of defending the miracles of the Bible, but in our very conception of what a miracle is. The latest defence and the latest definition will be found in the Moorhouse Lectures for 1914, delivered in Melbourne by the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D., and now published by Mr. Murray under the title of *The Miracles of the New Testament* (6s. net).

What is a miracle? A miracle, says Dr. Headlam, is 'the supremacy of the spiritual forces of the world to an extraordinarily marked degree over the mere material.'

For there are spiritual forces in the world and there are material forces; and when the spiritual forces get the upperhand of the material forces 'to an extraordinarily marked degree,' the result is a miracle. Take the human personality. It is partly spiritual and partly material. For 'there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.' And there is the material body. When the spiritual nature of man is so strengthened and inspired by God's Spirit as to make its powers more effective and enable it to overcome the natural weakness of the body or cure its ills—that is a miracle.

Now the Spirit of God works in the world just as the spirit of man works over his own body. It is therefore reasonable, Dr. Headlam holds, to expect that miracles should take place in nature as they take place in man. If there are healing miracles, there are likely to be also nature miracles. And, if few persons have much difficulty now in believing that the Spirit of God as incarnate in Jesus Christ could miraculously heal the body, few ought to find difficulty in believing that the same Spirit could walk on the water or turn water into wine.

It may be easier to conceive of the miraculous healing of a man born blind than of the miraculous feeding of five thousand men in a wilderness. But what right have we to confine the operation of the Spirit of God within the bounds of our imagination? Do you find it hard to believe in the Virgin Birth? Well, do not believe in it, is Dr. Headlam's advice, till you are able to believe in it. There is no reason why a man should be compelled to believe any miracle until he sees his way.

But do not deny a miracle which is credible to other men. Suspend your judgment. The time may come when, with the education of the imagination, or the study of the circumstances, you also will be able to believe it.

The time may come. And it may not. For it is very difficult in our day to believe in the turning of water into wine, or in any other of the nature miracles of the New Testament.

It must have been difficult always to those who really put their minds into the matter. For the material is very present, and the imagination that can even conceive of the spiritual, far less conceive of its taking the material and using it as a servant, has always been somewhat rare. But the difficulty has become much greater since the rise of physical science. There is the necessity of giving one's mind entirely to the study of material things if one would make any contribution to that science. It must be confessed that not many scientific men after the flesh believe in the Virgin Birth.

The more honour to those who do. The more honour to those men who, having given themselves to some department of physical research, have kept the material in its place. The more honour to those who, having become distinguished as men of science, are not less distinguished as men of God.

Seven of them have testified to their faith. Their testimony is contained in a little book entitled *Science and Religion* (Hammond; 1s. net). They came one after another to Browning Hall in London during 'Science Week' in 1914, and declared their belief that the spiritual is greater than the material, and that only in the recognition of its superiority can salvation be found by man or nation. One of them was Dr. Sims Woodhead, Professor of Pathology in the University of Cambridge.

Professor Sims Woodhead began at once by declaring that the cause of the European War was just the forgetfulness of this fact. 'Some of us,' he said, 'who have come into contact in recent years with some of the intellectual giants of Germany were beginning to be afraid that Germany's science has very little soul in it. But I think none of us realized the lack of morality that characterized, I will not say the nation, but certainly a great part of the mind of the nation. We none of us expected to find that the Germany which promised to become one of the great forces in civilization, and in advancing knowledge, science, culture, should so far have allowed itself to fall back, as it were, from the spiritual side of man's nature, from the soul of man. They seem, somehow or other, to have been so engrossed with the casket that they have paid very little attention to its contents. They seem to have been so occupied with the machinery, that they have left the driving power out of account. And when one thinks of the men who have been taking part in and with the advancement of Science in this country, one is glad to realize that many of our scientific men—there are many in Germany too—have realized that the physics and chemistry of men, and the machinery of the mere material aspect of men, are not everything. One cannot help feeling that in this great war we have an example of what materialism will lead men to. We have the head of a great State looking merely at the schemes of aggrandisement and materialism, evolved from many fertile brains, but which seem to end in nothing but agnosticism, or a lack of the sense of the true proportion between man as we know him and man's influence in this world.'

We see, then, that it is not a matter of no moment whether we believe in the Virgin Birth or not. If we do not believe in it, we must not be asked to say that we believe in it. But we must be asked to think. There is not one of the nature miracles of the New Testament that is incredible. We must set our minds in the right relation to God and the world. We must consider that the world is the instrument of the mind of God, and that it is not for us to limit Him in the use of

that instrument, so long as the use that He makes of it is in accordance with His own nature.

Before leaving the subject Dr. HEADLAM quotes four sentences from an article which was contributed to the *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1910 by the Rev. Robert VAUGHAN—'a theologian whose work is less known than it should be.' We quote the sentences after him: 'Miracle is a revelation of the latent possibility of things—of what they can become by divine activity within them. The whole of nature is by its creation so constituted that it can, according to its very *nature*, become what it is not in itself. It has a capacity to receive what it does not contain, and the isolated miracles, of Christ in particular, are to reveal this capacity. Such changes are not from the thing as it is in itself—and therefore not properly products of "nature," nor are they contradictions of the natural—for things of nature are created with a fitness for such transformation and evolution; but they are supra-natural by virtue of a communication to their nature of a fresh activity from their source.'

'If you would have a lesson in spiritual diagnosis, and probe deep into the subtleties of human nature, I counsel you to make a study of the obstacles Paul encountered in his passionate quest for the human soul; and if you would revive your faith in the supremacy of the Spirit and the divine aptitude of the Gospel of Jesus for the work it professes to do, you have but to follow Paul, in one of his numerous ventures, to carry Christ's saving grace within the citadel of a human life.'

What has St. Paul to encounter? Who are the enemies that hold the citadel? 'Imaginations,' he tells us. Not that these are the first to be encountered. The outworks of the human soul are held either by the frivolous or by the stolid. It is true that every preacher of the Gospel has before him 'spirits as responsive, as a frank and quick apprehension allows, to any truth he brings.' 'In every gathering of people there are some elect souls who thrill to a touch, some whom sorrow has chastened or joy purified, and these are the great sustainers of the preacher's message. If he attains any summit of mental or spiritual exultation, they are beside him, perhaps far beyond him, at his very best. If ever he stumbles on the deep things of God, they are certain to precede him with sure step, for they have long since faced the innermost mystery.'

But there are also before him, and probably in greater measure, the somewhat frivolous and the distressingly stolid. Before he comes to the imaginations of the imaginative, he has to meet those who face life with 'a vacuous flippancy that has never corrected itself by one searching glance into the realities of life'; and he has to meet those who are stolidly insensible, 'the people who hardly ever know a quickening pulse, the pull at the heart, the tense silence of the inner world, through which notes of destiny come clanging when deep calleth unto deep and God draws near.'

But when the frivolity or the stupidity of the hearer of the Gospel has been penetrated, what then? Then the preacher comes to the imaginations. He finds himself occupied with the not less difficult task of 'casting down imaginations' (2 Co 10^5).

It is the Rev. Alexander CONNELL, B.D., who has made that discovery. He has made it, no doubt, out of his own experience as a preacher. For in the volume of sermons which he has published under the title of *The Endless Quest* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) he speaks so fervently of the difficulty of the task, and so intimately of the variety of the imaginations that have to be cast down, that we cannot doubt he is matching St. Paul's experience with his own.

No sooner has a man's frivolity been suspended by the seriousness of the word, or his stolidity

pierced by its sharpness, than he instinctively sets himself on guard against the fateful obligations now clamouring in his conscience. There rise 'in his very track a cloud of reasonings, imaginings, speculations, sophistries, many of them in good faith, but all of them diverting attention from the crucial issue and postponing moral decisions. These are the "imaginations" of the text.'

'It is certain,' says Mr. CONNELL, using his surprising gift of vivid speech in its fulness, 'it is certain,' he says, 'that the Gospel has to fight every inch of ground until it come right within our heart with its mastery and healing, crooning over us, like a mother over a sick child, words of comfort and peace. And it is also certain that often our last defence against our better self and against the inflow of a tidal life is found in these imaginations which must be cast down.'

One form which the imaginations take is this. A man has passed through a process of disillusionment. The things that once had authority over him have it no more, and he has lost some of the things which he once held sacred. He has passed, 'not without a touch of self-complacency,' from the narrower and more mechanical views of his fathers to a larger and more tolerant attitude to life and God and the Bible. It is disconcerting to discover that the Gospel can reach him still, and can touch his conscience. But he remembers that the modern view, which he shares, has left a man free to say yes or no as he pleases, and almost to whatsoever he pleases. He has not gone beyond the hearing of the Gospel, however, and this preacher speaks directly to him. 'If,' he says, 'you imagine in entire good faith, that because some points of view have changed therefore the central things of religion are on their trial, and that you must await the issue of that trial, I believe you are profoundly mistaken and unreasonable in the last degree.'

A common and sometimes very keenly felt form which the imaginations take is doubt of the supernatural. There are those who deny it out and out, the fact of it and the possibility of it. There are more who hold their minds in suspense. They see how much hangs upon it. That Christianity is 'built upon an empty tomb' they do not deny. But even the resurrection of Jesus from the dead is much enveloped in mystery and difficult to establish as an historical fact.

Mr. CONNELL admits both the mystery and the difficulty. He admits the mystery that surrounds resurrection from the dead. But the world is full of mystery. 'If mystery and a vast ignorance are going to place an arrest on us, it is hard to see in what direction we shall not find our faculties paralysed. If you are inclined to doubt, when the miraculous appears in the Gospel, then the doubt may be limitless.'

He admits the difficulty. To prove the fact of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead is as great a difficulty as the historian or apologete has to undertake. But historical facts are not the only facts with which we have to do. The hunger for external fact is not the only hunger of the soul. 'You are anxious,' says Mr. CONNELL, 'to answer the craving of one faculty instead of satisfying the hunger of all faculties. And it cannot be done. For our great hunger is not for theories to be established, but for facts to be felt. And I cannot but believe that if a man but feel his godlessness as well as his limitation, and ventures everything on Christ, he will stumble into a light above the brightness of the sun.'

And let us not forget that while we, on our side, are doing our best to be morally direct and sincere, in casting down 'imaginations,' Christ is working from the other side. 'His Gospel will flame like the rising sun through the mists of unreasonable misunderstanding and mistimed speculation. And when His day dawns on us, we shall find that not our heart only, but our intellect also, has passed into a new climate, where Christian service can be what it ever ought to be—intelligent and devout.'

An Unnoticed Aramaism in St. Mark.

By J. Rendel Harris, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.

As the question of the existence of Aramaic influence in the Greek of the New Testament, including the case of what is definitely 'translation Greek,' is still an open question, in the sense that there is room for further demonstration of the existence of New Testament Semitisms, it may be worth while to draw attention to a striking case of Aramaic usage in St. Mark's Gospel, which, as far as I know, has hitherto escaped the notice of the critic and the commentator.

In the fourth chapter of Mark we are introduced to our Lord's parabolic teaching in the following manner: 'And he began again to teach by the sea-side; and there was gathered unto him a great multitude, so that he entered into a ship, and sat in the sea.' So the passage runs in the A.V. with sufficient accuracy for our purpose: the R.V., indeed, replaces 'ship' by 'boat,' a change which was probably rendered necessary by the fact that *ships* have become bigger since the time when the Authorized Version was made, and the equivalent *skiffs* have become smaller. Other trivial changes, like 'there is gathered unto him,' which is hardly English, do not concern us; what does concern us is that both translations, following the Greek literally, report that our Lord 'sat in the sea,' a proceeding which might be described in the style of Dean Burgon, as sufficiently uncomfortable. Dr. Moffatt, who is our latest and, in many respects, best interpreter of the sense of the N.T., evades the difficulty of position and simply says:

'He entered a boat on the sea and sat down'—*i.e.* it was the boat that was on the sea, and not Jesus that was in the sea.

It has, apparently, as I stated above, escaped notice that the expression ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι is the exact equivalent for the Aramaic term which describes the process which we call 'going on board.' Let me give one or two instances, translating Aramaic expressions as they certainly should be rendered.[1]

The Apocryphal *Acts of Thomas* are certainly Syriac in origin: we need not spend time in repeating proofs which every Syriac scholar can make for himself. In these Acts we have the story of how our Lord sells Thomas, his twin-brother, (so always in these Acts) to a merchant named Ḥabban, who is to take him by sea to India, where he is to build a palace for King Gundaphar. The story relates that 'Judas (Thomas) found Ḥabban the merchant carrying his goods on board the ship, and he began to carry them on board with him. And when they had *gone on board and sat down*, Ḥabban the merchant saith to Judas, What is thy art which thou art skilled in practising?'[2] Here the translator has been carried away by his own fidelity. There was no need to add the words 'and sat down.' In Syriac to 'go up (and) sit down' simply means to 'go on board.' Ḥabban and Judas might just as well have stood and talked as sat down and talked, so far as the language is concerned. Now let us see how the Greek translator of the Syriac Acts will render the idiom. We have as follows:

> ἐμβάντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ καθεσθέντων ἐξήταζεν ὁ Ἀββάνης τὸν ἀπόστολον λέγων.

Here we have the exact parallel to the Marcan ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι.

Later on in the Acts when Judas (Thomas) is commending his converts to the Heavenly care, he says to them: 'He will not forsake you. And if it be that ye sleep that sleep, which when a man sleeps, he is not, He will not sleep, but be wakeful and preserve you. *And if ye sit in a ship and on the sea*, where no man of you is able to help his fellow, He will walk upon the waves of the sea and support your ship.'[3]

Here the Aramaism, as often occurs, is slightly abbreviated, but is peculiarly interesting, because the very same expression 'to sit on the sea' occurs,

[1] In Moulton's *Prolegomena*, p. 241[2], the usage is already recognized as a possible case of translation Greek, as follows: 'Dr. Rendel Harris tells me that my example is a translation of a phrase meaning simply "he went on board." He observes "to go up and sit in a ship" is a pure Syriac expression. Sometimes you "sit in the sea" for "embark" (Mk iv. 1, the original here) . . . the recognition of this as translation Greek does not affect the grammatical category in which we place ἐμβάντα.'

[2] *Acta Thomae*, ed. Wright, p. 148.

[3] *Acts of Thomas*, ii. 204; the passage is important for its Dioscuric colouring.

which we noticed in Mark. And it is worthy of remark that the Greek translator has here evaded the awkwardness of a literal rendering by saying,

καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ πλεόντων ὑμῶν καὶ ἐν κινδύνῳ ὄντων,

so that he seems to have understood that to 'go up and sit in a ship' means to 'go on board and set sail.'

Instances might be multiplied to show that when a person 'sits in a ship' or 'goes up (and) sits in a ship,' the action of sitting is not involved, but only that of boarding a ship or embarking. The Edessan Syriac of the *Acts of Thomas* can be paralleled by the dialect which we call Palestinian Syriac; for instance, in the Palestinian *Life of Eulogius* the saint reports that

> 'Once upon a time I went to Thebais with one of my disciples and we sat in a ship,'

where he only means to say that 'once upon a time I sailed for Thebais in a ship with one of my disciples.'

Perhaps this will suffice to show what is the Aramaic way of describing an embarkation or a sea voyage. Note in passing that the Hebrew usage is altogether different: in Hebrew one 'descends' into a ship when one goes on board; but we need not spend time on this point: there is very little Hebrew in the N.T., though there are cases of Hebraized Aramaism.

Another instance may be taken from the Apocryphal *Acts of Philip*, which are also in the form edited by Wright, probably of Syriac origin. Philip goes to Cesarea, to find a ship that will take him to Carthage, where our Lord sends him to preach. He finds a ship that has been waiting twenty days for a wind. He addresses the captain who is fuming over the delay, but, struck with the appearance of Philip, he invites him to bring his baggage on board, and to pray for a favourable wind. Philip says:

'Thou seest me and my baggage: I have nothing else in the world, save Jesus the Messiah, and him crucified. But because I see that there are in thee the fruits of faith, order the people that are going with us to *come on board* (and) *sit down*[1] *in the ship*. And the captain ordered them and they all *came on board and sat down in it*.'[2]

Here even an English reader can see that we are dealing with an Aramaic idiom, and that it would have been quite a sufficient translation to say 'come on board,' or 'come on board the ship,' and that the longer periphrastic rendering ought to have been abbreviated. It is precisely this long circumlocution that underlies the passage that we are discussing in the Gospel of Mark.[3]

Now let us return to the Evangelists, and see how the other Synoptic writers will deal with the Marcan passage and its awkward Greek. Luke is especially interesting: he could not leave our Lord sitting in the sea, but being loyal to his text he did not want to get rid of καθῆσθαι or of ἐμβάντα. So he rewrote the passage as follows:

ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἕν τῶν πλοίων . . .
καθίσας δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου ἐδίδασκεν τοὺς ὄχλους
(Lk 5[3]).

The superfluous and not to be translated καθῆσθαι has now been explained to mean that Jesus sat in the boat when teaching. The original of Mark did not decide whether Jesus sat or stood.

Matthew takes a different line: he preserves carefully the ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι of Mark, but drops the confusing ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, so that no further misunderstanding can arise:

ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι
καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν εἱστήκει
(Mt 13[2]).

which really seems to be the best way of telling the story, if one has not the wit or the courage to neglect καθῆσθαι altogether. Matthew is, however, so far from neglecting the word that he makes a further introductory statement that Jesus sat by the sea! This is an alternative rendering.

When we turn to the Syriac Gospels, to see how they retranslate the language of Mark, we find that the Peshitto reproduces the Syriac idiom almost exactly:

'He went up (and) sat him in a ship on the sea';

but the Lewis Syriac, which is the earlier type, and which was made, as far as we can judge, under Hebrew or Hebraizing influence, says that 'he

[1] Lit. 'go up, sit.'
[2] *Apocryphal Acts*, ed. Wright, ii. 71.
[3] The linguistic usage is precisely similar to that for riding a horse: in Syriac, *to go up*, *ride* means simply *to mount*. Thus in the *Acts of Thomas*, the tamed wild ass says to the Apostle, *mount upon me* (lit. *go up*, *ride upon me*). And the apostle *mounted upon it* (lit. *went up*, *rode upon it*). Cf. Wright ii. 180, 182.

went down (and) sat him in the ship on the sea': this is idiomatic and Aramaic in the junction of the two related verbs and in the omission of the connexion link between the verbs, but it is Hebraistic in saying 'went down' instead of 'went up.' Cf. Jon 1^3, 'He went down into the ship to go with them,' where the LXX very naturally correct the expression to ἐνέβη εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦ πλεῦσαι κτέ, which may be compared with the Marcan text.[1]

In conclusion, it may not be amiss to point out that the investigation into these idiomatic nautical expressions is important in the interpretation of the opening verses of the 39th Ode of Solomon. I have elsewhere pointed out that the literal expression

> 'I went up into the light of truth as into a ship (or chariot)'

required modification, on the very ground which we have been examining: the language is certainly nautical and we must translate

> 'I *went on board* the Light of Truth as a ship.'

The '*Light of Truth*' is the name of the ship in which the Odist sails.

[1] The reading of the Lewis text is that given by Mrs. Lewis, and subsequently confirmed by Professor Hjelt. Professor Burkitt had wrongly altered it to agree with the Peshitto, thus obscuring an important point in the genesis of the Syriac Gospels.

The Heart of Jesus.

A COMMUNION MEDITATION.

By the Rev. Frederick J. Rae, M.A., Aberdeen.

One day as I was going round one of the military hospitals, I saw something that awakened my curiosity. Lying on the table beside a soldier's bed was a small square of white flannel, about the size of a child's palm. At the centre was a little heart of red flannel. Sewn on to the square above this was a tiny cross of the same red material. At the top, stuck in on a pin, was a very small Union Jack. And then below all these was sewed on the white flannel the words: 'Arrête! Le cœur de Jésus est avec moi' ('Stop! The heart of Jesus is with me'). This object had been handed to the soldier by a little Belgian child on the street of a village as he and his comrades had marched through. He did not know the meaning of the words on his souvenir. But when I translated them to him he was much affected, as well he might be. The incident struck me as very beautiful and touching. The stalwart soldiers swinging through the village, come there to help the weak and oppressed at the call of duty; and the little child stretching out a hand with this message from the unseen, a message surely of surpassing loveliness and power.

I am going to use this child's gift to-day to expound these words[1] about the Saviour. 'The heart of Jesus is with me'—that is simply a brief and telling summary of them. And the symbols above this sentence tell us what it means. Under this suggestive light the text has in it these four things about the sympathy of the Saviour: (1) The sympathy of Jesus is with the faithful; (2) the sympathy of Jesus is with the sufferer; (3) the sympathy of Jesus was purchased by the Cross: and (4) the sympathy of Jesus is our great incentive to prayer.

I.

The Sympathy of Jesus with the Faithful.

First, the sympathy of Jesus is with the faithful. That is what the Union Jack meant. The message of the little child to the soldier was something like this: 'You come to help us because we are weak. You come in the way of duty. And therefore you have the right to say, "The heart of Jesus is with me."'

Could anything be more encouraging for a soldier lad going into the fight than that! He had gone at his country's call. He had gone at the summons of helplessness and need. Who had a better right

[1] 'For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help us in time of need' (He $4^{15.\ 16}$).

to say to himself: The heart of Jesus is with me?

But the truth is not only for the soldier. The civilian who is in the way of duty has an equal right to it. Wherever he is, whatever he is doing, if he is doing his own task and facing his own God-given responsibility, he is among the faithful. He is where he should be. And he too can say with assurance: The heart of Jesus is with me.

We know that the heart of Jesus is with the faithful because the path He Himself trod all His days was the path of duty; and at all cost He held to it to the end. 'Wist ye not, I must be about my Father's business?' is His first recorded speech when He was twelve years of age. 'It is finished' was nearly His last. And all through He felt the compulsion of the divine will: 'I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day.' Therefore, when Jesus looks down upon this crowded field of human existence, where He Himself ploughed so straight a furrow, is it not on the faithful His heart rests with truest approval?

But we know this not only from our Saviour's own spirit. We know it by *experience*. Because it is through our faithfulness that the reality of Jesus' heavenly ministry comes home to us. God is found only on the highest level. We are sure of Him when we are true to conscience and are living faithful lives. No one is able to grasp more firmly the certainty of the living Christ than he who has a clean conscience. He who travels loyally through 'the long gorge' and wins his path upward over the rough crags of duty finds himself upon those 'shining table-lands to which our God Himself is moon and sun.' He knows in his soul, by a certainty nothing can weaken, that the heart of Jesus is with him.

And knowing this he has a great reward. Even here among ourselves it is a strength to know that some loved one's heart is with us. As we play the game with all our powers, it puts nerve into our arm to know that some one is up there in the crowd watching us and cheering us on, thrilling when we *make* a good stroke, full of sympathy when we *receive* one. But for mortal men engaged in the great game of life to know that in the unseen there is One Spectator whose heart is with them, who thrills with the thrill of our victory and feels the pain of our defeat, surely is a supreme encouragement.

II.

The Sympathy of Jesus with the Suffering.

Secondly, the sympathy of Jesus is with those who suffer. That is, I think, the meaning of the tiny red cross on the white square. When we read the memorials of our Lord's life, one impression remains very vivid—the fact that His heart was with the sufferer however his suffering was caused, even when it was caused by sin. Ignorance, pain, sorrow, loss drew out His pity. There seems to have been no exception. He walked among the suffering multitudes, and every one who was burdened had all His heart. When He saw in the Temple the traffic of money and beasts, it was not the profanation of the Holy Place that roused such fierce anger and prompted Him to actual violence. It was the fact that in all this traffic the weak and defenceless and poor were exploited. His charge against the priests was: You have made this place a den of thieves. You have used your privileges to steal the pittance of the poor in the name of religion. Out with you, you band of robbers!

If there was any class of sufferers who won the compassion of Jesus more than others it was probably those who suffered for righteousness' sake, and those who fell wounded in the battle of life, those on whom life had been hard. He was moved with compassion when He looked at them, the hungry, the blinded, the helpless, the worn out. *They* were not to blame. *They* were shut out of the light and blessedness of life not through any fault. And patiently and constantly He spent His strength day by day in lifting their burdens and bringing unaccustomed joy to their hearts. Many a man and woman had cause to say after He had passed by: The heart of Jesus is with me. There was never a day on which the kindness of the Master did not flow forth to the weary and burdened in words and deeds, in tears and smiles.

This also is a great enrichment of life. One of the priceless things in this world is such sympathy. We are glad to be cheered on by it when we are strong. But we value it even more when we are weak, when we fail, when we are brought low. Tolstoi gives us a very touching instance of this. He was in a low lodging-house in Moscow, and had uttered to some one a word of pity, 'when over the top of a partition one woman's head appeared, and then another, looking at him with strained atten-

tion. . . . I had not expected that a casual word would produce such an impression. . . . I had uttered a word of love and pity, and it produced upon these women such an effect that it seemed as if they had been waiting for it, to cease to be corpses, and become alive again.' Such is the value of even human sympathy to the needy. But if we can believe that the heart of Jesus is with us in our need, if we can believe that there, in the great life of the unseen God, is such sympathy for us as feels our difficulties and bears our load, if we can say, 'I am poor and needy, yet the Lord thinketh upon me,' surely life can never be without light or warmth, and our hearts never utterly without joy.

III.

Sympathy purchased by the Cross.

Now, thirdly, the sympathy of Jesus was purchased by the Cross. That is what is meant by the red cross and the red heart together, and that is what is meant by the words in our text: 'One who was at every point tried just as we are.'

There is indeed no sympathy that is not purchased by experience. You must have felt deeply yourself before you can feel with others. If you had lived a sheltered life of ease, what value would your feeling be to one who is in the hards, tempted unbearably and fighting a strenuous battle? If you had never known the ravages of death, you would be an outsider in a home of sorrow. It is not necessary that you should suffer just exactly what others are suffering. But it is necessary that you should have felt deeply, for your sympathy to be helpful. A soul that has never suffered will never exercise the ministry of sympathy among men. There is a beautiful passage in what I think is very nearly the greatest essay in our language, Francis Thompson's essay on Shelley, in which Thompson dwells on this truth in unforgettable words: 'Why should it be that the poets who have written for us the poetry richest in skiey grain, most free from admixture with the duller things of earth—the Shelleys, the Coleridges, the Keats—are the very poets whose lives are amongst the saddest records in literature? Is it that . . . the harvest waves richest over the battlefields of the soul? . . . Such a poet mists with sighs the window of his life, until the tears run down it; then some air of searching poetry, like an air of searching frost, turns it to a crystal wonder.' But if great literature is thus the fruit of suffering, it is true in a higher degree that the helpfulness of the greatest ministry on earth depends on such experience. And Jesus purchased His power to feel with us by His Cross. Why is it that the words 'The heart of Jesus is with me' are so precious, such strengthening words to say to ourselves? It is because Jesus felt the difficulties and sorrows of life so deeply. He knows and He cares. We have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities. It is no Olympian deity on a far-off throne whom we trust, whose presence is our salvation. It is one who has explored human experience, who lives *in* our life because He has *lived* our life, whose heart has borne the load, who was tried at all points like ourselves yet without failure. That is why it is a gospel to say, 'The heart of Jesus is with me.'

IV.

Sympathy and Prayer.

And now we come to the last point: the sympathy of Jesus is our great incentive to prayer: 'Let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace.' That is the right inference. When we think for a moment we feel that nothing more logical could be said. Jesus sympathizes with us, *therefore* let us come for help where help is sure to be offered. Why? Because the heart of Jesus is already on our side. It is pleading for us. There is in the Eternal God already before we ask a predisposition to give. He wants to give. Take an ordinary father. His heart is with his child. If it *can* be done, he is only too anxious to do what his child asks. His child does not need to wring a reluctant consent from him. He is no true father if that is his attitude. How then has it ever happened that prayer has been conceived of as wringing a favour from a reluctant God? It is an incredible idea. God is utterly willing. He is willing because His heart is with us. When we pray we are pushing at an open door. And therefore, if it possibly can be done, we shall have an answer. All the forces of the universe in God's hands are on our side, because the heart of Jesus is with us. *What an incentive to prayer!* It is no wonder the writer says, 'Let us therefore come with confidence to the throne of grace.' But not only is this an incentive to prayer. It should make prayer a joy. When we are on our knees, we can say to ourselves, 'The heart of Jesus

is with us,' and at once prayer will rush from our hearts impetuously. Once believe the great and wonderful truth in our text, so exquisitely summarized in the little Belgian child's gift, and all your difficulties about prayer vanish at once. For these difficulties are difficulties about *God*, not about prayer, and when once you believe God is on your side *with all His heart*, then you need no other argument for prayer. It only needs that you can say, 'The heart of Jesus is with me'; that is all. We have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but One who was at all points tried just as we are without failing. Let us therefore come to the throne of grace with joyful confidence to receive all God has for us, especially this—help in every time of need.

Literature.

JOHN BROWN PATON.

It would not be wise to prophesy that the biography of *John Brown Paton* by his son, Mr. J. Lewis Paton, the distinguished headmaster of the Manchester Grammar School (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s.)—it would not be wise, we say, to prophesy that it will henceforth be placed among 'the twenty best.' No prophecy is prudent. But it is quite certain that no biography has been published this season that can compare with it in interest; and of the biographies of the last few years, we would place beside it only Cook's *Ruskin* and Mrs. Watts's *George Frederic Watts*.

And we confess that all this is a surprise. We had no idea that Dr. Paton of Nottingham was so great a man. We had no idea that he was so good a man. We had no idea that he combined greatness and goodness so exquisitely and to such far-reaching practical purpose. If there are those among us who are sincerely troubled by the War, troubled as to the fact and the future of Christianity, no tonic that could be administered would steady our nerves and strengthen our faith like the reading of this book. Here is a Christian, and the like of him you could never get, apart from the direct influence of Christ, though you search the Old World and the New. He was perfectly human and most lovable; he was ideally Christ-like and adorable.

We mentioned his practice. His life was all practice. No thought came to him but it was translated into deed. He ruled the Nottingham Institute so well that his students throughout the Church idolized him—to his own distress sometimes. But all the while he was probably the originator, and certainly the heart and soul, of an almost innumerable number of schemes devised and persisted in for the benefit of the race and the coming of the Kingdom. He took an active interest in education, in the land, in holidays, in the Inner Mission, in the Colony of Mercy, in the National Home Reading Union, in the Sunday School, in the Institute of Social Service, in the Young Men's Brigade of Service, in the problem of the city poor.

And how men loved him! This is what one man, the Bishop of Hereford, says: 'It is thirty-five years since I had the good fortune to meet Dr. Paton in the Alps and to walk for a whole day down a beautiful Alpine valley, drinking in some of the inspiration which he carried with him wherever he went in those days, and which he carries with him still. I confess that of the many friends of the past there is not one to whom I owe so much for inspiration to good works, so much suggestion, so much encouragement to persevere in the face of difficulties. To have had a share in so many different movements is in itself much for one man, but Dr. Paton has not only been connected with these movements, he has been the heart and soul of them, the inspirer, the initiator, and the suggestor of methods, a supporter in times of discouragement, and a uniter at all times. . . . The spirit which has animated him we may describe as the spirit of the Inner Mission of Christ. If there is one idea that has inspired him it has been that all who bear the name of Christ should realize that they are engaged in the Inner Mission of purifying the whole life of the community, that they are doing the work, however humble it may be, in Christ's name and in response to His call, to be at their posts as His servants and soldiers.'

ST. CLAIRE.

A biography of St. Claire has been written by Mr. Ernest Gilliat-Smith, and has been published by Messrs. Dent under the title of *Saint Claire of Assisi: Her Life and Legislation* (10s. 6d. net).

It is a biography that is intended not to add to the host of popular biographies of St. Claire or her friend St. Francis, but by its work on the original sources and its author's feeling for historical accuracy, to supersede all earlier biographies whatsoever. As a rule the sources, whether Thomas of Celano or the Pope Alexander or any other, are quoted verbatim; when they are summarized the Latin text is given in full. On every other page Mr. Gilliat-Smith finds himself at variance with previous biographies. He is particularly antagonistic to Sabatier, often contemptuous, and never misses a chance of ridiculing his easy eloquence. And this is not due to any religious difference; for both are good sons of the Roman Church. It is due to that different conception of what the writing of history demands which was so conspicuously seen last century in the controversy between Froude and Freeman.

Mr. Gilliat-Smith is not content to write the Life of St. Claire. He is not content to describe her Rule and its history. He takes within his domain the whole life of the Religious in the century in which St. Claire lived. And here also he finds himself in sharp opposition to Sabatier. He does not believe that the morality of the Church in the Middle Ages was so deplorable as Sabatier paints it. On that matter he can be as eloquent as Sabatier himself. His words are well worth quoting and very welcome.

'Thus much—and much more might be said did space permit—concerning active orders in various parts of Christendom, which originated at a time when, we are told, the Church was in full decadence, and were still doing admirable work a hundred years later, when she was *in extremis*, and Saint Francis stepped in and miraculously saved her from dissolution, according to the gospel of Sabatier.

'And if we turn to the contemporary communities which had no external work peculiar to them—Benedictine, Cistercian, Cluniac, and, though later, the hermit orders of the Grande Chartreuse, of Camaldoli, of Vallombrosa—we find the same phenomenon: thistles producing figs; thorns, grapes in abundance, and fruit of the finest quality. If the monasteries of the eleven hundreds were indeed hotbeds of vice, saints without number were nurtured in these dens of abomination, and if the monks of the same period were deserters from the battle of life, somehow or other they came to the fore in every branch of human activity, and when men wanted a leader they looked for him, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred they found him, in the ranks of these wastrels. Amongst them were mystics like Adam of Saint Victor, and Richard and Hugh of the same house, of whom Neale says that they were "three of the greatest men of that marvellous twelfth century," and of Adam, that "he was the greatest Latin poet not only of mediæval but of all ages." There were statesmen, too, and scholars, like Lanfranc, who made the Benedictine Abbey of Bec—a cluster of huts when he came there—the foremost school in Christendom; philosophers and men of letters like his pupil and successor in the See of Canterbury, Saint Anselm; men who knew how to fight, like that stalwart hermit Saint Hugh, who wore the cowl when he was eight years old, and when he was fifty exchanged a Carthusian cell for the See of Lincoln.'

Under the title of *The Emotions of Jesus* (T. & T. Clark; 2s. net), Professor Robert Law, D.D., the author of that great book *The Tests of Life*, has published a small volume in which he writes simply, evangelically, and with psychological accuracy, of the Joy of Jesus, the Geniality of Jesus, the Compassion of Jesus (both for the suffering and for the sinful), the Anger of Jesus, and the Wonder of Jesus. There is also a sermon on 'Straitened,' and a most useful bibliography for each topic. It is one of the 'Short Course' series. It is an ideal example of a short course of sermons.

The Incomparable Christ is the title of a volume of essays, or sermons without texts, written by Calvin Weiss Laufer, and published by the Abingdon Press, New York ($1 net). 'The Incomparable Christ' is the first essay in the volume. Other essays are on the Atonement, Jesus and the Child, Jesus Christ and the Crowd, Jesus Christ's Spiritual Supremacy, Jesus Christ's Enrichment of Life. And these are not half the essays that the volume contains. In every one of them there is

thought which is reverent and reverently expressed. There is not an Americanism in the book, which we will not deny is a blessed relief.

There is a certain suspicion attaching to the phrase 'mental science,' which the book called *Home Course in Mental Science*, by Helen Wilmans, is not likely to dispel (Bell; 4s. 6d. net). It belongs to the 'High Thought' series, which had better be called the 'Loose Thought' series. Thus there is a chapter on Prayer and Self-culture, which, either ignorantly or maliciously, is a sheer abuse of the word 'prayer.' Prayer is identified, absolutely identified, with effort at self-improvement—and that of the ordinary 'prosperous in business' type. 'This self-culture,' says the author, 'is the real and only prayer. It goes forth in effort and is expressed in results.' But with all its worship of success, the book is full of silliness. 'Here we are,' says the author again, 'we who have prayed, or aspired ourselves into men—here we are all ready to pray, or aspire ourselves into gods—by which I mean men who know their own power.' Why have books like these such a circulation? Are we after all, as Carlyle said, mostly fools?

It is related of the now notorious Treitschke that he had pleasure in the Bible because it contained the record of great fights and fighters. He says so himself. It is recorded in his biography. Who would have thought of placing Treitschke and Professor James Cooper of the University of Glasgow together? Yet it is Professor Cooper that writes the Guild Primer on *The Soldiers of the Bible* (A. & C. Black; 6d. net), and writes it with evident enjoyment. Nevertheless he has no affinity with German 'frightfulness.' If there is ever to be true fighting, at the heart of it there must be faith. 'All false doctrine,' he says, 'is ruinous to Christian morals, as the conduct of too many of our present enemies (1914) demonstrates: their crimes are the direct fruit of opinions that for forty years have been sedulously inculcated in Germany, *e.g.* Bismarck's beatitude, "*Beati possidentes*," "Blessed are they that have"—in opposition to our Lord's "Blessed are ye poor" (St. Luke vi. 20); Nietzsche's railing at pity; and Bernhardi's making light of treaty obligations (Ps. xv. 4).' It is a student's book, written with the thought of examinations, and with the greater thought of a judgment to come.

The Rev. John Lamond, B.D., Minister of Greenside Parish Church, Edinburgh, has published a volume of what we take to be his ordinary Sunday evening sermons. He has published the sermons to be an encouragement to other preachers. For he has found that by their brevity, their evangelicalism, and their pertinence to present-day life, his church has been filled night after night.

They are short, but by no means absurdly short. They are always and entirely modern, but they do not simply take their texts from the newspaper posters. There is a sermon on the loss of the *Titanic*, and there is a sermon on 'The Menace of Germany'—for the rest the modernity is in the treatment rather than the topic.

The title is *The Eternal Christ* (Blackwood; 5s.).

When a man is a preacher his preaching should be the best of him. The preaching of Dr. E. C. Wickham, Dean of Lincoln, was the best of him. It was himself. As he preached he lived. As he lived he preached. The Bishop of Southwark was so impressed with Dr. Wickham as a preacher and as an example to other preachers that he has persuaded Dr. Wickham's friends to publish another volume of his sermons. Its title is *Words of Light and Life* (Humphrey Milford; 5s. net). 'Pretentiousness,' says the Bishop of Southwark, 'confused thought, passionate advocacy, exaggeration, partisanship, words "full of sound and fury signifying nothing"—these mark the betrayal of the trust committed to the Minister of the Word: and the trust is too often betrayed. And I venture to say that these are some of the sins into which the modern preacher is most liable to fall. Against such sins of preaching this volume rises up and bears its witness of reality and spiritual force.' That is all true. No claim is made that will not be made good to those who read the volume.

In a sermon on Meekness, Dr. Wickham refers to Bismarck, whose death had just taken place when he preached it. What he says is worth quoting to-day: 'We have been witnessing in this last week, and it cannot but be with human sympathy, the passing away of a man whose character and actions have marked the history of Europe in the last half of this century only less than those of Napoleon in its opening years. He must command in many ways the admiration of

men. His own country can never forget what he effected for her. Over a new-made grave it is a natural instinct that bids us remember what is good—his loyalty and patriotism, his devotion to his country's interests as he saw them, his great achievements, his gentle personal traits, his purity of character and motive. But none the less we ought not to be blind to the dangers and evils of the spirit which his example and influence have done so much to awaken in Europe, the terrible and limitless rivalry between Christian nations in armaments, which make peace scarcely less exhausting than war, the belief in force (to use his own words, in "*blood and iron*") as the true method of social advance, the contempt for the weak, the avowal and justification of national selfishness. It is the very spirit against which the *meekness* of the Psalmist is a perpetual protest and appeal.'

Prayer gives the distinctive note to the new volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.). There are many sermons on prayer in it—most of them in reference to the War; and there are prayers—two that are congregational, by Dr. Horton, two 'in Time of War,' and one a Prayer of Dedication. There is also a Sailor's Prayer and a Soldier's Prayer. All this is as we are glad to have it. Never were men and women more ready to pray or more willing to be taught how to pray.

Dr. Paul Vinogradoff, F.B.A., Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford, is probably the greatest Russian scholar in this country. He is a patriot also; but not of the Treitschke pattern. His book on *The Russian Problem* (Constable; 1s. net) is a lesson on real patriotism as well as a revelation of Russian aspirations. It contains two articles, one on 'Russia after the War,' and one entitled 'Russia: The Psychology of a Nation.'

Considering how necessary to the student of the New Testament is accurate knowledge of the conditions of life at the time, it is astonishing that so few books have been written on the subject. An addition to Messrs. Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology,' under the title of *The Environment of Early Christianity* (2s. 6d. net) will actually fill a gap. There are large books, like Schürer's and Hausrath's, but these are for professors. This is for the ordinary preacher, or teacher, or intelligent New Testament reader. The author is the Rev. S. Angus, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament and Historical Theology in St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney. It is a marvellously full book. And it is as fresh as it is full. The series has been a success throughout; and there is not a better book in it.

Inspiration is the short title of a small book by Mr. James Porter Mills (Fifield; 2s. net). But there is an addition to the title: *The Great Within*. For it is not a theological essay this. By inspiration the author means faith. 'Inspiration is but another name for faith' are his own words. But the faith is to be exercised for the healing of the body, not the salvation of the soul. What is the method? It is simple resignation. 'To illustrate what I mean, let me tell you of a clergyman I once knew who had come into a knowledge of this teaching, and had practised it on others, when one day he got an attack of rheumatism himself. He tried to throw it off by the methods he had taught others, using denial and affirmation, and coming down upon himself with great severity, and he worked thus for hours and hours but with no effect—the whole time he was in the spirit of the pain. In this spirit he made great statements, declaring that he was a son of God and the like, while all the time he was in a spirit that was ready to smite. At last it came to him that he should not resist, should bless and not curse. Instead of fighting the pain he simply accepted it, and said over and over again, "Blessed pain," and in a very short time the whole thing was broken up.'

Two further volumes have been issued of 'The Iona Books.' The one is a history of *Saint Giles*, the Patron Saint of Edinburgh, by the Rev. D. Butler, M.A., D.D. The other is a reprint of Fiona Macleod's *Pride of the Isles* (T. N. Foulis; 6d. net each). The Iona Booklets are *sui generis*—in outward appearance as arresting as in inward grace satisfying.

George Gilfillan accomplished an amazing quantity of literary work while he controlled a huge congregation and wrote long sermons. Yet he did it so well that just when the time seems come for forgetting him he recovers himself and starts on a new career of popularity. Did you think his

Martyrs and Heroes of the Scottish Covenant was dead? Messrs. Gall & Inglis have issued a new edition, the tenth (3s. 6d.), well printed, illustrated, and ready for a new generation of charmed readers.

The Gleam on the Hill is the title of a volume by Mr. S. Raleigh Simpson which contains letters to a person of immature years (Gardner; 2s. 6d. net). The tone of the letters is cheerful and the information they offer is useful. Is it an optimistic father who writes? No, he is too jocose. Say a jolly uncle, who does not forget to sweeten his jokes with a small 'pour boire' in every letter. The reader, however, will need no bribe.

The Rev. H. F. Hamilton, D.D., recently wrote a great book on *The People of God.* It was at once recognized as a most original and powerful argument for the truth of Revelation as it is enshrined in the Old Testament and the New. But it was a book in two large volumes, beyond the reach of many who would have found profit and joy in its pages. So the editors of the Layman's Library have asked Dr. Hamilton to prepare a smaller book, and let the world know how sure the truth of Divine revelation is and how good it is for character. He has done so. The book is entitled *Discovery and Revelation* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net).

Canon C. E. Scott-Moncrieff, D.D., has written an essay on *The Consciousness of the Spiritual* (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net). His purpose in writing it is 'to examine the nature, origin, and characteristics of spiritual life; to maintain its reality and value; and to point to Christianity as its most perfect manifestation.' He recognizes at once the necessity of saying what the spiritual life means to him; and after a careful inquiry he offers this definition: 'Spiritual life used in a religious sense is the source of such action of man's spirit as implies a conviction that he is in communion with a living power or powers, superior to himself, which he believes to direct and control the course of nature and of human life.'

The essay is occupied mostly with the contents of the spiritual life, which are first stated briefly and then explained fully. Three elements make it up—the sense of dependence, the moral sense, and the sense of beauty. Manifestly it is a great thing—wide as the creation of God and rich as God's nature. And Canon Scott-Moncrieff allows no 'ifs' or 'buts' to limit the wideness or the wealth of it.

A great fascination still flows from the names of Pascal, Arnauld, Angélique. It is the fascination that always clings to the pursuit of truth when wedded to persecution. It may be that we do the deeds of those who killed the prophets, but at any rate we have a strong desire to build their tombs.

But there are degrees of attraction. Over the mind of the Rev. Henry Thornhill Morgan, Vicar of Crowthorne, it was irresistible. He bought every book on Port Royal that he could find in catalogue or on bookstall, and what he bought he read. He read so diligently that he became probably the best authority on Jansenism in his day. Now and then the command he had of the subject was revealed in exquisite articles in the *Church Quarterly* and other periodicals. Some of these articles are brought into a volume entitled *Port Royal, and other Studies* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), which must be read by every one to whom the great 'heresy' makes its wonderful appeal.

But what sort of man was the Rev. Henry Thornhill Morgan? This letter written to one of his lads who had gone to study for Holy Orders will tell us. 'Dearest lad, I want you in your theological studies to be honest, thorough, and as widely varied as you can—never say a thing unless you *believe* it—try and have good grounds for your belief (not merely that "Mr. So-and-so has said it")—try and get at the real truth about Scripture and its meaning—do not attach yourself too much to *one* particular school or tendency, but learn from the truth itself *what*ever it may teach you. Many clergy are profound (or shallow) *humbugs*—they repeat dogmas like the parrot—let it be your object to *learn thoroughly*, speak *honestly*: when you don't know, say so. Life is very short—let us, in what time we have, be *sincere*: let us be always *learning* as well as teaching. Pardon all this "homiletic."'

What are the important elements in a teacher's personality? Mr. F. L. Clapp of the University of Illinois, secured from one hundred experienced school superintendents and principals—men who had had wide experience in selecting and training teachers—lists of the ten *specific qualities* that, in their opinion, went to make up a good teaching

personality. As one would expect, the replies included a wide variety of these specific qualities. In fact, almost every imaginable trait or characteristic found a place in the aggregate list. Most of these qualities, however, were mentioned by only one or two individuals, comparatively few were found in all of the separate lists. But there were ten qualities which found a place in a large number of lists, and these ten in the order of their frequency, were the following:

1. Sympathy.
2. Personal appearance.
3. Address.
4. Sincerity.
5. Optimism.
6. Enthusiasm.
7. Scholarship.
8. Vitality.
9. Fairness.
10. Reserve or dignity.

All this and much more of most practical and valuable helpfulness to teacher and preacher is given in a charmingly fresh volume on *School Discipline*, written by William Chandler Bagley, Professor of Education in the University of Illinois (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). Its contribution to the study of Ethics is none the less scientific that it is given incidentally. Teachers whether of day or of Sunday schools should not miss the book on any account.

Mr. Harry Charles Lukach is a traveller who travels for the joy of it. He writes with quite unusual literary excellence for a traveller: but he does not travel in order to write. No doubt that is why he writes so well, for all is spontaneous and natural. He writes as he sees. His art is simple; it is the artlessness of real life. Into *The City of Dancing Dervishes* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. Lukach has gathered some magazine articles and added some chapters that are new. The title is taken from a description of Konia, the ancient Iconium. Students of the New Testament must see it; for the contrast between the Iconium of St. Paul's travels and this Muhammadan city of dancing dervishes is very striking and very illuminating. What it might have been if Christ had held the place that Muhammad usurped! But Christ is coming back to Iconium.

Among the other chapters there is an amusing one on a certain Khoja or Schoolmaster of Aqshehir, of whom many stories are told at Muslim firesides. They illustrate the idea of humour entertained by Islam, a compound of cunning and foolishness. This is one of the stories:

'His donkey strayed and could not be found. The Khoja ran all over the town looking for him, at the same time exclaiming loudly, "Praise be to God!"

'Some passer-by whom he had induced to help in the search asked him what his reason was for praising God thus loudly.

'"I praise God," replied the Khoja, "because I was not on the donkey's back when he disappeared, for, if I had been, we should both infallibly have been lost."'

The most important chapters are those on Islam in Turkey and the Turkish Khalifate. These chapters have much serious historical value. The book is illustrated and altogether acceptable.

One of the things which the War has forced upon our attention is the persistent way in which the Germans have striven to attain efficiency in every line of business and of life. The book, therefore, called *Economics of Efficiency*, written by Professor Norris A. Brisco of New York, which aims at teaching us how to obtain efficiency as the Germans have obtained it, comes at an opportune time (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). And it is the right book. Without leaving a loophole of escape for idleness or ignorance, Professor Brisco insists that 'efficiency demands a scientific study of the different phases of work to ascertain how it can best be done with the least expenditure of energy, time, and materials. 'There are many ways,' he says, 'of doing things, but only one is best. This is the most efficient way, and the aim of every business man should be to find the best way for every task in his business, and to have the actual performance approach as nearly as possible to the best. The old method does not pay any heed to ascertaining the best way, while the new, or efficient, method finds the best way first. When business is conducted on improved methods, it is run by proved knowledge rather than by guess. Efficiency utilizes to the fullest extent the valuable experience of the past. A science of work takes the place of the old rule-of-thumb methods. A substitution of exact knowledge is made for guesswork, efficiency increases, and at the same time wastes are reduced and profits increased.'

It is a practical book. And not the least practical of its chapters are those on Training and on Habit. It is so practical that the smallest matters are considered as carefully as the largest. The

'lunch problem,' for example, is discussed with the utmost earnestness, washing-troughs, also, and swimming tanks, and the evil effects of spitting. We have seen nothing anywhere so pointed, so thorough, and so very pertinent to the time.

The Rev. Henry Beach Carré, B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Theology and English Exegesis in Vanderbilt University, has written a book on *Paul's Doctrine of Redemption* (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). His studies in the Pauline theology have brought him to the following positions:

'(1) Paul had a dualistic philosophy, according to which two opposing cosmic forces, God and Satan, were arrayed against each other in a struggle for the control of the universe.

'(2) The history of the cosmos was divided into two periods, or ages, "the present age" and the "coming age." During "the present age," Satan and his hosts ruled the world. But "the present age" is reaching its end, and "the coming age" is just about to be ushered in. With "the coming age" the rule of Satan ceases, and the rule of God will be supreme.

'(3) Man became involved in the cosmic struggle between God and Satan, through his progenitor, Adam, who, because of his disobedience to God, passed under the control of Sin and Death, carrying along with him his entire progeny, who ever since have suffered countless misfortunes and afflictions in this life and stand doomed to eternal destruction.

'(4) God in His love has provided for man a way of escape from this hopeless condition, and a complete transformation, in which he attains to God's own likeness and to a participation in His functions as ruler and judge of the universe. This rescue and transformation Paul designates in several ways, but chiefly by the words salvation and redemption.'

Dr. Carré lays down these propositions in no dogmatic temper: he is ready for the discussion of them. One thing is clear. Recent eschatological work has compelled a revision of our knowledge of Paul's theology. Perhaps Dr. Carré shows the way we must take.

A very urgent necessity lies upon us all to do something for the protection of our young people in great cities—in cities great and small. Read Louise de Koven Bowen's *Safeguards for City Youth* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). Its revelations are only incidental; the object of the book is to suggest ways of meeting the evil and to encourage us to take our part in the business. But the revelations are awful. We must quote one of them.

'Less than two years ago Chicago was horrified by a very brutal murder committed by six young men and boys, apparently without any object, even that of petty theft, as the truck gardener whom they killed early one morning, as he was driving into the city, had in his possession but a few dollars which he vainly offered in exchange for his life.

'Four of the young men suffered the extreme penalty of the law, capital punishment. Two of them, brothers, were 24 and 21 years old, and another was less than 19. Two other boys, both under 17 years of age, who were associated with the crime were sent to the State Penitentiary. The boys confessed to the revolting crime, which was apparently without mitigating circumstances, and throughout the trial bore themselves with unbroken bravado; until confronted by the death sentence, they exhibited no remorse.

'Although a protest was made by many citizens against the brutalizing effect upon the community of such a wholesale execution, and although these citizens added to the usual arguments against capital punishment the plea that many states had abolished it for minors even when retaining it for adults, it was evident that public sentiment as a whole upheld the drastic punishment.

'At that time, however, the whole subject of the "juvenile offender" came up for discussion in Chicago, and many conditions were discovered which stirred a careless city to a new sense of compunction. When an experienced settlement worker visited the homes of all the young men and boys involved in the crime, she discovered that all but one of them had been born in the old country and brought to America when quite young; the parents were labouring people without education or privilege; the fathers were absorbed in the dreary grind of earning food and shelter for their large families in this new land where work is none too plentiful and where there are so many problems for the immigrant; the mothers were absorbed in the care of their younger children. One mother said, "I have had fourteen children and have had no life outside my kitchen. You see how that is. How could I see where my boy was going?" All

of the mothers admitted that they asked no questions about the work their boys were doing, nor the conditions under which it was done, whether they found the work congenial or distasteful. The only question was, "How much money on Saturday?" The father of two of the boys said, less than a week before the day set for the execution, "I don't care what they do with them; they may hang them or shoot them; it is nothing to me." On being asked how he, the father, could speak so brutally of his own sons, he answered, with a shrug of his shoulders, "Neither of those boys ever brought home a penny."'

It is that last sentence that is the revelation. Could anything be more appalling? Well, we have here an opportunity, read the book, and then——

Messrs. Methuen find that there is still a market for Sir Oliver Lodge's *Reason and Belief*, and they have issued a cheap edition (1s. net). It is the most literary of all Sir Oliver Lodge's books, and the more likely on that account to last.

The title of Mr. Carveth Read's book on logic —*Logic Deductive and Inductive* (Moring; 6s.)— inevitably recalls the work of Professor Bain on which many of us cut our logical teeth. And it is an appropriate recollection. For Mr. Read is of the school of Mill and Bain, as he frankly acknowledges in his preface, and as much more than the title of his book makes evident. It is the method that is still taught in at least one of the Scottish Universities, and that it has its supporters elsewhere there is the best evidence in the fact that a reprint of this book has been called for every year. Mr. Read has now read it all over again and revised it as he read. He has found it necessary to rewrite some passages and to add some new sections. This is the fourth edition. It is an excellent college book, made more serviceable than ever and brought into touch with the latest study of its subject.

Messrs. Nisbet have issued *The Church Directory and Almanack* for 1915 (2s. 6d. net), together with *The Church Pulpit Year Book* (2s. net). We love value for our money even in books: there is no better value to be had than the *Directory and Almanack*. It was nothing short of a revolution in Directories. Before, they were the most expensive of books, a luxury best done without; this Directory is now a necessity for everybody and within everybody's easy reach.

The Directory is a little thicker than before; the Year Book is a little thinner. The sermons are more condensed. But there are illustrations at the end of every sermon.

The Rev. C. F. Hogg and the Rev. W. E. Vine, M.A., both already known as expositors of the Word, have agreed to edit together *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians*, and their exposition has been published in Glasgow in a handsome volume by Messrs. Pickering & Inglis (3s. 6d. net). It is a verbal exposition. The editors hold with Westcott, who said, 'That since it had pleased God to reveal His mind to men through the medium of words he intended to devote his life to their study.' They also have determined to devote their lives to the study of the words of the Bible. This is the value of the exposition. Every word is examined with great care and thoroughness. In most cases all the examples of its use in the New Testament are given. And we are able to see for ourselves what is most likely to be its meaning even in the most difficult passages. Good instances are the words for 'sanctification' (on 1 Th 4^{3}) and 'light' (on 1 Th 5^{5}). Perhaps we had best quote the note on 'light.' Better than any criticism it will reveal the editor's method and capacity. The phrase is 'sons of light.'

'Primarily light is a luminous emanation, probably of force, from certain bodies, which enables the eye to discern form and colour. Light requires an organ adapted for its reception, Matt. 6^{22}. Where the eye is absent, or where it has become impaired from any cause, light is useless. Man, naturally, is incapable of receiving spiritual light inasmuch as he lacks the capacity for spiritual things, 1 Cor. 2^{14}. Hence believers are called "sons of light," not merely because they have received a revelation from God, but because in the New Birth they have received the spiritual capacity for it.

'Apart from natural phenomena, light is used in Scripture of—

a. The glory of God's dwelling-place, 1 Tim. 6^{16}:

b. The nature of God, 1 John 1^{5}:

c. The impartiality of God, Jas. 1^{17}:

d. The favour of God, Ps. 4^{6}; of the King, Prov. 16^{15}; of an influential man, Job 29^{24}:

e. God, as the illuminator of His people, Isa. $60^{19.\ 20}$:

f. The Lord Jesus as the illuminator of men, John 8^{12}, Acts 13^{47}:

g. The illuminating power of the Scriptures, Ps. 119^{105}; and of the judgments and commandments of God, Isa. 51^{4}, Prov. 6^{23}, cp. Ps. 43^{3}:

h. The guidance of God, Job 29^{3}, Ps. 112^{4}, Isa. 50^{10}; and, ironically, of the guidance of man, Rom. 2^{19}:

i. Salvation, 1 Pet. 2^{9}:

j. Righteousness, Rom. 13^{12}, 2 Cor. $11^{14.\ 15}$, 1 John $2^{9.\ 10}$:

k. Witness for God, Matt. $5^{14.\ 16}$:

l. Prosperity and general well-being, Esther 8^{16}, Job 18^{18}, Isa. $58^{8\text{-}10}$.'

Another biography has been written of W. T. Stead. And yet this is not the final and authoritative biography. But it is right well written. The greater part of it is occupied with Stead's spiritualistic experiences, the author, Miss Edith K. Harper, having been his secretary and co-worker in that part of his many activities. But Miss Harper can write, and those who are not interested in Stead the Spiritualist will enjoy much of this book. Miss Harper can write not only sympathetically but quite memorably. Wherever she got her style, it is almost as incisive as Stead's own, and her ear is as sensitive to the rhythm of prose.

One of the excellent things which she brings out of the storehouse of her memory is Stead's wonderful belief in the efficacy of prayer. 'He seemed,' she says in one place, 'as though perpetually sustained by some unfailing source of energy that hurled him headlong through existence, as on some great Adventure. This he expressed as being "switched on to the Power-House of the Universe," and he maintained that it was "up to every one" to be thus switched-up simply by keeping the line of communication—prayer—open and in good working order every day.'

With this belief in the efficacy of prayer came trust in God's providence all round. 'Those who knew him best can recall how in some long-drawn-out tangle of perplexity, when light seemed for the moment withdrawn, there were "lions in the path," and in the press of conflict it would seem that the Guiding Will had been strangely inexorable, even strangely hard, how those clear, far-seeing blue eyes—which saw so deeply and so tenderly into the problems and mysteries of existence—would look for just a moment, with a quick, half-puzzled second glance, as though to be quite sure of having grasped the stern significance aright; then the old calm serenity would return, the loving trust, the unquenchable faith—nay, the *certainty* that "His 'best' is better for us than our own can ever be," and that to belong to the Great All-Wise, All-Loving Father, just to be used by Him as a humble instrument for his own inscrutable purposes, is the only possible rule of life. There is no describing the effect of seeing this constant attitude of sweet, unshakable trust, lived out daily before one's eyes, in the midst of the most pressing of the world's affairs. To many it was the most lovable, the most touching trait in his character.'

The title is *Stead: The Man* (Rider; 7s. 6d. net).

That wonderful book of 'deep sea trials and gospel triumphs,' *Nor'ard of the Dogger*, by Mr. E. J. Mather, has been issued by Messrs. Simpkin at the price of one shilling net. This is its forty-second thousand. Give it ten times that circulation.

The Rev. G. A. Tindall, B.A., has published a volume containing *Plain and Practical Lessons for Confirmation Candidates and Others* (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net).

The *Short Studies on Bible Subjects* of Mr. William Dale, F.S.A., F.G.S. (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net), are sermons. They are sermons with a sense of service in them, the clear recognition that life is not in listening to sermons, but 'if ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them.' Yet there is exposition. There is this exposition of a verse in the story of Lot, taken from *The Times* for March 29, 1910—

'"Come round to the port side." There, that's Pelé.' Pelé—it looks innocent enough, the full outline of the mountain clear-cut against the sky, the cone truncated as sharply as the top of an egg which has been sliced with a knife. In the awful moment on the 8th May, 1902, when the cap of the mountain lifted before the blast of flame swept down on the city and on the shore, the masts and funnels of ships that lay off shore were lifted off by the mere concussion. In the long, curved line

of the bay before us is St. Pierre, the town of sleep, the city of the dead.

'Before us as we land lies the wide, paved street which runs along the water-front. "And there," says the ship's officer who is my guide and counsellor, "was the wickedest spot in the whole West Indies. That row of houses pink and white to the left. The French nature, you know, away from the restraints of home, with the ignorance and docility of the blacks—it is a bad combination—and it is impossible not to remember, 'The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar. Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and He overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground.'" There are legends told of blasphemous rites which were in progress when the fire from the Lord out of heaven was rained down, legends which may have grown up since. But there seems to have been good ground for that description, "the wickedest spot in the West Indies"; and of over 40,000 people who were presumably in the city at the time only one man escaped—a prisoner under sentence of death for murder, confined in a cell impervious to the flames—and he only escaped to die of the shock a few days later.'

When Jesus answered Mary, and said, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' what business did He speak of? The Rev. J. Frank Smith, D.D., answers with a book which he calls *My Father's Business and Mine* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). The business was multifarious, he says, but all essential. It was to give life (the text of the sermon in which that form of the business is expounded being Jn 10^{10}, 'I came that they may have life'). It was to do the will of God (the text, He 10^{7}, 'Lo, I am come. . . to do thy will, O God'). In this way a series of sermons has been preached, linked together, and each on a great text of Scripture. And in the sermons there is much home truth and modern illustration.

The Lord's Prayer has been expounded in many ways. Has it ever before been expounded in direct reference to war? This is how the Right Rev. H. L. Paget, D.D., Bishop of Stepney, has gone through it, clause by clause, making each clause tell us our duty in the present conflict. So, though the book is an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, he calls it *In the Day of Battle* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). He wrote the book at the request of the Bishop of London, and the Bishop of London says, 'It is just what I expected it to be. It is clear, pointed, and original.' And that testimony is true.

The Walter Scott Publishing Company have added another volume to their 'Great Writers' series. It is *Tennyson*, and its author is Mr. Arthur Turnbull (1s. net). We miss one thing, and miss it seriously—the usual grand bibliography at the end. Otherwise the book is most acceptable—a really fresh estimate of the most abundantly estimated author since Shakespeare.

Our Lord said, 'Go ye into all the world and make disciples of every creature, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' Have we missed the force of the words 'teaching them'? The Rev. Gerard Sampson, C.R., of the House of the Resurrection, Mirfield, thinks so; and he writes a book *In Praise of Teaching Missions, and How to Conduct them* (Wells Gardner; 1s. 6d. net).

The Rev. J. Stuart Holden, M.A., has gone through the Gospels, choosing a phrase here and a sentence there and explaining what they mean. The phrases and sentences are not chosen for explanation because of their difficulty, but because they are useful for edification. 'The purpose of this volume,' says its author, 'is to afford help in the daily gathering of the Manna to those who come to the Holy Word for spiritual sustenance and strength.' The title is *The Holy Gospels Opened* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net).

The Rev. James M. Campbell has written a book on *The Place of Prayer in the Christian Religion* (Methodist Book Concern; $1 net). It is not an original book, and it does not profess to be. There is room for an investigation of the place which Prayer has had in the Christian life of the centuries, but Mr. Campbell has not made it. He has been content to repeat in popular form what has very often been said already about the prayers of the New Testament, adding to that some sensible words on the various kinds of prayer

—private, silent, ejaculatory, family, social, public —and on the difficulty of maintaining habits of prayer in the present day. It is all pleasantly written and will be pleasantly read.

The gift of speaking to men is rather more common than the gift of speaking to children—probably because we all forget so soon. One of those who have the gift, and have it rather eminently, is the Rev. James Burns, M.A. This will be admitted at once by those who look into his new volume of 'Addresses to Men' entitled *Laws of the Upward Life* (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net). What are the laws of the Upward Life? They are Infection, Sacrifice, Recompense, Accommodation, Heredity, Influence, Competition, and Habit. Are we mistaken in finding a recollection here and there of the Rev. W. A. Gray's *Laws and Landmarks of the Spiritual Life*? There is nothing illegitimate. There is even the most legitimate competition with that book in memorable thought and arresting phrase.

Dr. Harvey Reeves Calkins describes himself as 'Stewardship Secretary in the Methodist Episcopal Church.' He is therefore a very proper person to write about *A Man and his Money* (Methodist Book Concern; $1 net). There is a great deal that he feels able to say about a man and his money, and some of those who read his book in manuscript told him that he ought to say it all, making the book much larger. But he has given himself to one aspect, and one only, of the great money question, the aspect of stewardship. He writes as a Christian to Christians. Much of our cherished conception of the use of money is entirely pagan, he says. He would have us eliminate the paganism, and recognize that every penny we possess is the Lord's, whose stewards we are and nothing more. The idea is not new, but where will you find it carried into all the relationships of life as it is carried here? Where will you find the mischief of the misuse of money set forth with so great picturesqueness of American language? Where will you find the real value of a penny brought home to you with such sincere and sensible insistence?

The Yattendon Hymnal has a history. It was originally issued in instalments of 40 pages, containing 25 hymns each, and was completed in 1899, and published in that year by Mr. Frowde at 20s. Its price is now 30s. net, and it is obtained only from Mr. Blackwell. The music and the words were afterwards issued separately. A black-letter edition of the hymns was afterwards issued from Dr. Daniel's press, limited to 150 copies, and is now out of print. The Word-book has just been republished under the title of *The Small Hymn-Book* (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net).

A new edition has been issued of *Pro Fide:* 'A Defence of Natural and Revealed Religion,' by the Rev. Charles Harris, D.D. (Murray; 10s. 6d. net). It is 'a new and augmented edition, brought up to date, with fuller discussion of the Bodily Resurrection, the Virgin Birth, and Modernism; and with the Bibliographies rewritten throughout.'

Surely Dr. Harris is more conservative than he was in the first edition. That he was conspicuously so then, no one said. He is conspicuously so now. But whether it is that theology has moved forward (with Dr. Sanday) while Dr. Harris has stood still, or that Dr. Harris, like other men, is growing more conservative as he grows older, it is hard to tell. Certainly he is conservative in this edition and throws himself whole-heartedly on the side of the Bishop of Zanzibar with his unexpected attack on Modernism. He says that 'Modernism has few friends (at any rate among attached members of the Church) *outside purely academical circles.*' But that is rather a startling exception. Inside purely academical circles most of our scholars are found, the men who have given themselves most thoroughly to the study of these questions.

The new edition does actually bring the book up to date in all its departments. Dr. Harris knows what the theologians are doing all over the wide world.

A Study in the Synoptic Problem.

By the Ven. Willoughby C. Allen, M.A., Principal of Egerton Hall, and Archdeacon of Manchester.

The literary relationship of Mt 11[2-19] to Lk 7[18-35] is a very complex problem in literary criticism. In Mt 11[2-11. 16-19] we have two blocks of matter to which Lk 7[18-28. 31-35] are parallel. But the connecting links, namely, Mt 11[12-15] and Lk 7[29. 30] are totally different. St. Matthew has *ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν. πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν. καὶ εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, οὗτός ἐστιν Ἠλείας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω*, whilst St. Luke has *καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν. βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου. οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς. μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.*

Now we might explain these facts in more than one way. *E.g.* A, it might be supposed that the whole section as it is found in St. Matthew is taken from Q, or, as I should prefer to say, from the Matthean Logia. In that case St. Luke would have taken some offence to vv.[12-14], and indeed they are very difficult, and substituted for them a comment (Lk 7[29. 30]).

Or B, we might suppose that the two blocks (Mt 11[2-11. 15-19]) stood either as one connected whole, or as two independent sections, in the Logia, and that the editor has either inserted into the one discourse other sayings (vv.[12-15]) which stood elsewhere in the Logia, or has taken these sayings in order to serve as a connecting link between the two independent blocks. In either case he has done what he frequently does, namely, combine sayings of a detached kind, in this case vv.[12-14], with larger blocks of discourse, in this case vv.[2-11. 15-19].

That B is right is probably proved by the fact that St. Luke has a parallel to Mt 11[12. 13] in chap. 16[16], *ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου. ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται.* Since these words stand in quite a different connexion from that of St. Matthew, it is probable that in the source, or sources, lying behind the two Gospels, they were not connected with Mt 11[2-11. 16-19], but were detached fragments.

But if B is right, how are we to explain the fact that working quite independently it should have occurred to St. Luke to do what the editor of the First Gospel has done, namely, either insert into a long section from his source a comment, or connect two different sections of his source with a comment? In the first case, why put in a comment at exactly the same place as the editor of the First Gospel? In the second case, why connect two sections with a comment at all? Indeed, how should two writers independently hit upon the idea of combining these same two sections?

There remain therefore the problems—(1) How explain the occurrence of Mt 11[12-15] and Lk 7[29-30] at the same place in a discourse which must ultimately have come from a source common to the two Gospels? (2) What is the relationship between Mt 11[12. 13] and Lk 16[16]?

The answer to both these questions is, I believe, to be found in the fact that St. Luke was acquainted with the First Gospel.

He probably had before him chap. 11 of St. Matthew, and also a parallel account in another Greek source also ultimately derived from the Logia. In rewriting the section for his Gospel he might have followed this second account, but he notices or remembers that in the First Gospel after the words, 'he that is less in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he,' there occur the words of Mt 11[12. 13]. He found these words very difficult, as do modern commentators, and he substitutes for them a comment which he conceived would reproduce their general tenor. 'The kingdom of heaven is taken by violence' when those who might be supposed to have no right to it, 'the tax-collectors and the common people' (cf. Jn 7[49], 'this multitude that knoweth not the law are accursed'), laid claim to it by submitting to John's baptism, whilst those who believed that they alone had a right to the kingdom, the lawyers and the Pharisees, refused his baptism.

Somewhat later St. Luke found in his saying source a secondary form of the saying which he has thus obliterated by a comment. This he placed at 16[16]. We may suppose that this saying

was either very similarly worded to that of Mt $11^{12.13}$, or that it had already been paraphrased into much the same form as that in which St. Luke gives it. In either case the paraphraser, whether St. Luke or some one before him, has recognized that St. Matthew's words are very obscure, and that the ultimate saying that lies behind them conveyed the sense that the 'kingdom of heaven' had burst its supposed limits as confined to law-abiding Jews, or was being seized by others than those who regarded themselves as the rightful inheritors of it, and was now being made accessible to others, it was being 'preached,' and 'every one,' *i.e.* not merely the law-abiding Jew, 'was forcing his way' into it.

If what has been said is upon the right lines, then we have an answer to our first question. Mt 11^{12-14} and Lk $7^{29.30}$ occur at the same place in a discourse, not because they have been placed there independently by the two Gospel writers, but because the verse in St. Luke is a commentary upon the verses in St. Matthew. That St. Luke should have been acquainted with the First Gospel is *a priori* probable. That he does not anywhere directly betray his knowledge of it has led to the common supposition of critics that he had not seen it. But why should he make much use of, or directly borrow from, every Gospel book with which he was acquainted? Supposing that the purpose and general point of view was quite other than his own, then he would naturally not make frequent use of it. I have tried to show that in the case under discussion he knew and commented upon the First Gospel, and there are one or two other passages where the explanation of words found in both Gospels by the suggestion that St. Luke had seen the First Gospel is at least as probable as any other. Such are Mt 7^{28} = Lk 7^{1} and Mt $21^{43.44}$ = Lk 20^{18}. On these see the *Commentary on St. Matthew* in the 'International Critical Commentary,' pp. 73 and 233.

We may now consider our second problem. What is the relationship between Mt $11^{12.13}$ and Lk 16^{16}? That St. Matthew drew the saying from his discourse (the Matthean Logia?) is probable. That the words in St. Luke come also ultimately from this source, but probably through another medium than the Greek translation used by the editor of the First Gospel, is very likely. I believe that the saying in the original Aramaic form was a rather obscurely expressed one, but that it might have been translated 'the kingdom of heaven is being burst through, and law-breakers are seizing it.' The sense of this was that Jesus in His preaching was opening the kingdom of heaven to others than the orthodox Pharisaic Jew. I will not here discuss the Aramaic root lying behind *βιάζεται*, *βιασταί*, but may refer to an article by Dr. Marshall in the *Critical Review*, vi. 48. The Aramaic root which lies behind would, as Dr. Marshall shows, suggest violent persons of a special kind, *i.e.* persons who broke through the fence of the Law, and did not duly observe it, such persons as the tax-collectors and sinners who are so often referred to in the Gospels. Indeed, I think it possible that this Aramaic word has usually been rendered in our Gospels 'sinners.' Compare St. Paul's use of *ἁμαρτωλός* as applicable to himself and St. Peter when they threw over the Law for faith in Christ, and his denial of the applicability of the term to himself and St. Peter whilst they remained faithful to the Law (Gal 2^{15-17}). Compare also the equation of *ἁμαρτωλός* (Lk $6^{32.33}$) with *τελῶνης* (Mt 5^{46}) and *ἐθνικός* (Mt 5^{47}).

If something like this was the meaning of the Aramaic saying, the editor of the First Gospel has obscured, probably intentionally, the meaning. For in his rendering the special application to the opening of the kingdom of heaven to the unorthodox and outcast is, if not lost, at least obscured by the fact that his Greek does not immediately suggest this to a Greek reader. The translator who lies behind St. Luke's version has seen the meaning of the words. He feels that mere translation will not bring out their significance, and so he paraphrases. 'The kingdom is burst open' when it is preached to all men without condition or limitation, and when 'all press into it.'

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS.

Romans vii. 24, 25.

O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

1. The experience which St. Paul describes in this chapter is probably personal, something through which he himself had passed. It is true that sometimes, as in his Epistle to the Corinthians, he speaks of himself while he really denotes others. As he says, 'Now these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes.' But in the present instance he had no motive for adopting this device. And the vivid lights and shadows which now brighten and now darken his description, the expressive touches which disclose so much of the writer's personality, the tragic earnestness of it all, seem to demonstrate that we have here an excerpt from the Apostle's autobiography, the history of his own spiritual conflict.

2. But here arises a question which has been very stoutly debated: Is Paul describing his Christian or his pre-Christian experience? It is easy to find forcible arguments on both sides. But, as Dr. Denney has well said: 'The much discussed question, whether the subject of this passage is the unregenerate or the regenerate self, is hardly real. The distinction in its absolute form belongs to doctrine, not to experience. No one could have written the passage but a Christian; it is the experience of the unregenerate, we may say, but seen through regenerate eyes, interpreted in a regenerate mind. It is the Apostle's spiritual history, but universalised.' This, then, is St. Paul's confession. As compared with the confessions of Augustine and Bunyan and others it is unique for its sincerity, and self-knowledge, and spiritual insight, and power.

A by no means incompetent judge has declared his own conviction that this seventh chapter of Romans is 'most certainly the most terrible tragedy in all literature, ancient or modern, sacred or profane.' 'Set beside the seventh of the Romans,' he says, 'all your so-called great tragedies—your Macbeths, your Hamlets, your Lears, your Othellos—are all but so many stage-plays; so much sound and fury, signifying next to nothing when set alongside this awful tragedy of sin. . . . The seventh of the Romans should always be printed in letters of blood. Here are passions. Here are terror and pity. Here heaven and hell meet, as nowhere else in heaven or hell; and that, too, for their last grapple together for the everlasting possession of that immortal soul, till you have a tragedy indeed; beside which there is no other tragedy.[1]

I.

St. Paul's Discovery.

It was not the intention of the Apostle to relate in chronological order the various phases of his experience. He refers now to one, now to another, as they recur to him, without any attempt to classify them, or to show the sequence which linked them together. It is, therefore, only in a rough way that it is possible to trace the successive stages of it. But it is not difficult to disentangle his rapid transitions of thought and to see that he made three discoveries.

1. The first was *the reality of sin*. Through the working of the Law in his heart, sin revived, and it appeared in its true colours as sin. How natural is the tendency of the human heart to excuse sin; to regard it not as sin at all, but only as weakness, or quite venial—a peccadillo, neither disapproved of God nor worth troubling oneself about. Even writers of high moral tone like Matthew Arnold speak of it as mere infirmity, or ascribe it to defects of blood—a standpoint which is in sharp contrast to that which St. Paul took and which has been taken almost without exception by Christian thinkers. No discovery is more radical than that wrong-doing is sin against God, not merely injurious to the offender or to others implicated in his acts, but an affront to the majesty of heaven. The ancient saints thus regarded their transgressions, especially the psalmists who poured out their heart-felt confessions; but none saw it more clearly, or had deeper views of it, than the Apostle Paul, who counted himself the chief of sinners.

2. Again, the Apostle, through the Law, discovered *the exceeding sinfulness of sin*: 'that

[1] J. H. Jowett, *The Transfigured Church*, 107.

sin,' he writes, 'by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.' While he ascribes this discovery to the Law in its holiness and purity, he owed it chiefly to the Cross of Christ. He was reading his past experience from the standpoint of the gospel. It was in Christ, not under the Law, that he attained to adequate views of what sin is in its spirit, and what it led to when wicked men under its influence crucified the Lord of life and glory. And it is ever at the Cross that these profound impressions are produced.

3. He discovered, also, that *sin had a deep root in his sinful self.* He had not only committed sinful acts, but he had a sinful heart, which made the case more desperate. He became conscious of an inward schism, 'a law in his members, warring against the law of his mind.' In him, as in us all, there was a higher and a lower self, and the lower self had gained ascendancy, and had brought him into captivity. He spoke of himself as though composed of two separate and opposite personalities. Xenophon mentions a certain Persian who said of himself, 'Certainly I must have two souls, for plainly it is not one and the same which is both evil and good, and at the same time wishes to do a thing and not to do it. Plainly, then, there are two souls; and when the good one prevails, then it does good, and when the evil one prevails, then it does evil.' In some such way St. Paul seems to be speaking of himself. He tells us that the good he would—that is, willed or determined to do—he did not; but that the evil he willed or determined not to do, that he did. He then explains that this state of things was owing to two opposite natures or laws in him, one good and the other bad, which were, so to speak, like two persons of opposite characters. The one he calls 'I,' which is the good nature or the good person; the other he calls 'sin,' or the law of sin,' which is the bad nature or bad person.

We have most of us read Stevenson's thrilling book in which this thought is worked into a story—the story of a man with two names, living in two different spheres as opposite to each other as light and darkness. And the power of the story, apart from the graphic way in which the conception is developed, is derived from the fact that it awakens a response in the reader and compels him to say to himself, 'Thou art the man.' Without intentional or conscious hypocrisy, there is contrariety between our better and our lower nature which is answerable for many glaring nconsistencies.

II.

His Misery.

'O wretched man that I am!'

1. St. Paul may be thought by some to be here describing himself in figure for others; but, if so, we may drop the disguise and treat the words as revealing his personal experience. Why was he wretched? It was not through a harrowing fear of consequences, either near or remote, a looking for of judgment and fiery indignation. Not that, but the slings and arrows of an accusing conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God. It was the hell, not of future punishment, but of wrong-doing, the sense of God's displeasure, the hidings of God's face, the self-loathing of an awakening soul—this it was that cast its awful shadow over his spirit, and extorted the cry, 'O wretched man that I am!'

That nothing in life gives a man so much trouble as himself is generally allowed. In this sense, better than in any other, the old saying holds good, that a man's foes are they of his own household. To be wounded in the house of friends is distressing, but to be beaten down and baffled by the persistent refusal of our own heart to submit to discipline, to find faults still surviving in vigour and cropping out unexpectedly after the efforts of years to subdue them, is amongst the saddest of mortal experiences. No one is spared from this universal lot, yet fellowship therein brings no comfort. It is the standing background of every life, but no familiarity and no degree of repetition make it tolerable. Such seemingly helpless captivity under the law of sin may well provoke the hopeless groan, 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?'

In Christian experience, however, such despondency can never be more than a passing mood. The proper attitude for a soul, against which the battle seems to be going is, 'When I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me' (Mic 7^{8}).[1]

2. But many men, and women too, who are wretched to-day are so from a far different cause. It is not the hell of an accusing conscience that disturbs them, but the hell of ill-success, or loss, or some effects of sin.

The word Hell is still frequently in use among the English people: but I could not without difficulty ascertain what they meant by it. Hell generally signifies the Infinite Terror, the thing a man *is* infinitely afraid of, and shudders and shrinks from, struggling with his whole soul to escape from it. There is a Hell therefore, if you will consider, which accompanies man, in all stages of his history, and religious or other development: but the Hells of men and

[1] Dr. Waddy Moss.

Peoples differ notably. With Christians it is the infinite terror of being found guilty before the Just Judge. . . . And now what is it, if you pierce through his Cants, his oft-repeated Hearsays, what he calls his Worships, and so forth, —what is it that the modern English soul does, in very truth, dread infinitely, and contemplate with entire despair? What *is* his Hell, after all these reputable, oft-repeated Hearsays, what is it? With hesitation, with astonishment, I pronounce it to be: The terror of 'Not succeeding,' of not making money, fame, or some other figure in the world,—chiefly of not making money! Is not that a somewhat singular Hell?[1]

III.

His Helplessness.

'Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?'

1. It is when the imperative of duty, the voice of conscience, begins to make itself heard, when the degradation and misery, the shame and guilt of a life of sensuality or self-indulgence begin to be felt, and the moral will is roused to assert itself—it is then, in the effort to be free, to escape from spiritual bondage, that we become aware of the fatal strength of the power that masters us. For it is to be remarked that at the stage indicated in the text the conflict is always an unequal one.

If the will were simply an unbiassed umpire between contending claimants, between the right and the pleasant, between the lower or carnal and the higher or spiritual nature, the conflict would be waged on equal terms and the issue at worst uncertain. But it is not so. The life of impulse long precedes the other and claims, so to speak, a prescriptive right to rule. When the struggle comes, the will is no impartial arbiter. A thousand acts of selfish indulgence have woven themselves into its very essence and given it an evil bias against the unfamiliar demands of duty. No wonder then, in such circumstances, — with emotion, passion, inclination, and the ingrained force of habit on the one side, and only the authoritative voice of a law we respect and fear but have not learnt to love on the other,—that the endeavour after a better life should issue only in a profound and painful sense of impotence and baffled service.

The agitation which such a state of mind involves has often found a poetic expression for itself, as in many of the hymns used in Public Worship; or, for example, in the following lines:

How to sate the deep sin-sorrow waked with each returning morrow,
As the longing after Right yields to Evil's matchless might,
While the thronèd Self is speeding downwards to the Fiend's onleading,
Deaf to warning voice, or heeding as a dreamer to the cries,
Phantomlike, that call Arise!

Father, ah! my soul is dreary, chilled my hopes, my feet way-weary;
And o'ermatched in the sore strife, though I know the way of life,
Yet my resolutions fail me, and my will can but bewail me,
And my night is cold and starless, and no gleams of rising morn
O'er the eastern clouds are borne.[2]

2. One peculiarity of this experience is that it compels us to look away from self, upward to God. Speak to a man under this consciousness of the power of sin and the weakness of his own nature to resist—speak to him about finding help to resist, through studying the laws of that nature of which he is himself a part, and through exercising that will, whose feebleness appals him, and you mock him, as if you spoke to a man in a raging fever of the necessity of studying his own temperament and constitution, and of the duty of keeping himself cool. He would do it were the fever not burning in his veins. What is wanted in either case is help from without—from some source of life, and health, and energy, outside himself—from some one 'mighty to save,' who should restore the wasted strength from his own fountains of life—who should say to the internal conflict 'Peace, be still.'

In a letter to Alexander Cunningham, Robert Burns wrote:

'There are two great pillars that bear us up amid the wreck of misfortune and misery. The one is composed of a certain noble, stubborn something in man, known by the name of courage, fortitude, magnanimity. The other is made up of those feelings and sentiments which, however the sceptic may deny them or the enthusiast may disfigure them, are yet, I am convinced, original and component parts of the human soul, those senses of the mind—if I may be allowed the expression—which connect us with and link us to those awful, obscure realities: an all-powerful and equally beneficent God, and a world to come, beyond death and the grave.'

[1] Carlyle, *Past and Present*, 125.

[2] J. H. Moulton, *Visions of Sin*, 219.

3. The consciousness of sin is so far a universal fact of human nature that, if any one of us is without it, it is because of some disease, a defect in his own mind. 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.' The conviction of sin may be stifled within us, it is so stifled every day; and yet it is universal. As light is universal, although some may shut their eyes close and admit none of it, so is the consciousness of sin universal, although many believe that they have got rid of it altogether. For this very absence of conviction only proves the incompleteness of their nature. They deceive themselves, and the truth is not in them. They have lost the feeling of sin that was given them as a safeguard. It burns them like a fire; but their skin has lost all sensation. They are sleeping steeped in cold mists and poisonous dews, but they know not the poison because they are asleep. Yet fire burns, and poison destroys, not the less when the senses, which are sentinels against them, desert their posts.

Every man whose nature is complete, and awake, and active, knows that there is such a thing as sin, and that he is a partaker in it. The man who has tried for a quarter of a century to pare off from his mind all that does not minister to one chosen worldly pursuit will be able to deny that he is convinced of sin. But you appeal from such maimed and crippled spirits to the general sense of more complete minds. And the result is the admission that there is a better law, which our conscience admits the authority of, warring against the law of pride and self-will and appetite within us, and that the worse prevails against the better, and that the sense of guilt accompanies that wrong decision in every case. So then the sense of sin is not something abnormal, exceptional, that begins in superstition and mental depression, and is kept up by religious teachers by artificial means; it is the fair and natural result of facts. We know the better way, we choose the worse, and we are ashamed of it; these are three plain facts, which contain all that we contend for. Not those who sorrow for sin are deceiving themselves, but those who deny its existence.

4. These two natures will never cease to struggle so long as we are in this world. The old nature will never give up; it will never cry truce, it will never ask for a treaty to be made between the two. It will always strike as often as it can. When it lies still it will only be preparing for some future battle. The battle of Christian with Apollyon lasted three hours; but the battle of Christian with himself lasted all the way from the Wicket-gate to the River Jordan. The enemy within can never be driven out while we are here. Satan may sometimes be absent from us, and get such a defeat that he is glad to go howling back to his den, but the old Adam abideth with us from the first even to the last. He was with us when we first believed in Jesus, and long ere that, and he will be with us till that moment when we shall leave our bones in the grave, our fears in the Jordan, and our sins in oblivion. So it is ours ever to keep our eyes fixed, as Paul did, upon the Christ of God, and daily we shall receive of His fulness, grace upon grace.

> My faith burns low, my hope burns low,
> Only my heart's desire cries out in me
> By the deep thunder of its want and woe,
> Cries out to Thee.
>
> Lord, Thou art Life, tho' I be dead,
> Love's Fire Thou art, however cold I be;
> Nor heaven have I, nor place to lay my head,
> Nor home, but Thee.[1]

Literature.

Arnold (T.), *Christian Life and Doctrine*, 37.
Banks (L. A.), *Sermons which have won Souls*, 461.
,, ,, *Paul and his Friends*, 297.
Caird (J.), *University Sermons*, 93.
Farrar (F. W.), *Truths to Live by*, 233.
How (W. W.), *Plain Words*, i. 69.
Jowett (J. H.), *The Transfigured Church*, 107.
Kingsley (C.), *All Saints' Day and other Sermons*, 41.
Lilley (A. L.), *The Soul of St. Paul*, 104.
Macmillan (H.), *Two Worlds are Ours*, 342.
Moulton (J. H.), *Visions of Sin*, 219.
Murray (A.), *Absolute Surrender*, 133.
Price (A. C.), *Fifty Sermons*, iv. 65.
Sanderson (T.), *Unfulfilled Designs*, 54.
Simon (D. W.), in *Sermons by Welshmen in English Pulpits*, 256.
Spurgeon (C. H.), *New Park Street Pulpit*, v. No. 235.
Story (R. H.), *Creed and Conduct*, 93.
Thomson (W.), *Sermons preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel*, 188.

[1] Christina G. Rossetti.

The Excavations at Babylon.[1]

By the Rev. James Baikie, Edinburgh.

English readers have now the opportunity of studying Dr. Koldewey's own account of the excavations which he has carried on at Babylon since 1899. The results of fourteen years' hard work are gathered up into a volume of 335 pages, as lavishly illustrated as the most exacting could desire; the translation is fluent and readable; and the publishers have given the book every chance by the way in which they have produced it. Until further excavations bring new facts to light, this must stand for our knowledge of Babylon; and even then the volume will still be indispensable as the record of a most important stage in the growth of information.

Yet withal there can be no question that the result of so much patient labour is somewhat disappointing. The blame does not lie with Dr. Koldewey, save in one particular, to be referred to later. It lies first with Sennacherib, whose methods of dealing with recalcitrant cities were of a thoroughness which might earn the approval even of the German Great Staff, and who made an example of Babylon in 689 B.C.; next, with the various conquerors who since the days of Nabuna'id have devastated the town; last, with the native brick-diggers who, for many years, have made the mounds of Babel a quarry. It is fairly certain that nothing of importance has escaped the explorers in the portion of the ruins with which they have dealt—after all, only a half of the total area; the things were not there to find—that is where the disappointment comes in. Particularly is this the case with regard to objects of artistic interest. It is scarcely credible that a site so extensive, occupied for so long by such a race, should have yielded nothing more than the pitiful fragments which are all that have rewarded the explorer's efforts. The work once was there, for the decoration of certain parts of the Southern Citadel is undeniably good, though not so brilliant as one would have expected; but the process of destruction has been carried out with a thoroughness which has left next to nothing for even the most patient investigator.

The area of ground recognized as having certainly come within the enclosure of the great city, embraces five principal mounds—Babil, on the extreme north of the site; the Kasr, in the centre; Amran-ibn-ali, on the south; with Merkes, a little east of the line between the Kasr and Amran; and Homera still further to the east. In addition, the low-lying area known as Sachn, or the Pan, has proved of the utmost importance. Previous excavation under Layard, Oppert, and Rassam had accomplished very little; though Rassam's work in the southern part of the site yielded a multitude of business documents, particularly those of the great banking house of Egibi, and the precious Cyrus Cylinder describing the capture of the city. The sites, in particular, were in hopeless confusion, each explorer having his own fancy as to the location of the various buildings of historic fame. Koldewey's work, though admittedly only a beginning, has at least put an end to some of this uncertainty, and certain of the points which have long been in dispute may now be regarded as settled—particularly the position of the Great Tower of Babel, and possibly also that of the Hanging Gardens, though here there is still uncertainty.

Herodotus' description of the vast enclosing wall of Babylon is familiar to all. The circuit of the walls, he says, was 180 stadia, the breadth of the wall 50 royal cubits, its height 200 cubits, while on the summit of the wall stood a number of buildings of one storey, leaving space before them for a four-horse chariot to turn on the wall. One hundred gates with brazen or bronze posts and leaves pierced this great *enceinte*, and an inner wall, not much inferior to the outer one, formed a second line of defence. Investigation shows that in some respects Herodotus was not so far out as has been supposed. His circuit, of course, is monstrously exaggerated; in fact, it looks very much in this and in other instances as though the ancient writers had mistaken the measurement of the whole circumference for that of one side. Thus divided by four, most of the measurements would work out fairly well.

The outer wall of Babylon was a most formidable structure. The fosse was faced on its inner side

[1] *The Excavations at Babylon.* By Robert Koldewey (Macmillan; 21s. net).

by a wall of burnt brick 3·3 metres in thickness. Then came the main outer wall, also of burnt brick, and 7·8 metres thick, then an interval of 12 metres, and then an inner wall of crude brick, 7 metres thick. The 12-metre space between the two walls was filled in with brick rubble, so that the whole formed one tremendous structure over 80 feet in thickness. Not even the walls of Tiryns can compare with this. The inner wall had cavalier towers at intervals, which would show a single storey above the outer wall, just as Herodotus says, and the broad surface of the military road along the top quite bears out his statement as to the chariots. Koldewey remarks that two four-horse chariots could pass each other readily on the top of the wall. The height of this great wall of course remains unknown, and the estimate of Herodotus is no doubt an exaggeration; but in any case it must have been a stupendous and imposing defence.

Within the walls the main interest of the excavations gathers around two points—the Southern Citadel in the Kasr mound, and the Tower Etemenanki and Temple Esagila in Sachn and the adjacent part of Amran. Up the midst of the great triangular area between the walls and the Euphrates, there runs the main artery of ancient Babylon, the Procession Street. The middle section of this noble roadway is paved with fine limestone blocks 1·05 metres square, while the side-walks are formed of 66-centimetre blocks of red breccia, veined with white, each block bearing upon one of its edges an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar. On either side the street is lined with lofty defence walls, so that it could be made a mere death-trap for hostile troops; and these walls are adorned with lions in low relief in enamelled brick. Half-way up the street the roadway is bestridden by the great Ishtar Gate, guarded by double towers adorned with enamelled reliefs of bulls and dragons. On the eastern side of this gate lay the Temple of Ninmach, on the western the great complex of the Southern Citadel. The *ensemble* of this gate, with its rows of gaily coloured creatures, its bronze lions and dragons, and the huge flanking temple and palace must have been magnificent.

A gate on the west side of Procession Street gives access to the first courtyard of Nebuchadnezzar's great palace of the Southern Citadel. Around the open space are many chambers opening on the courtyard—probably, as Dr. Koldewey conjectures, offices of the administration. Multitudes of inscribed bricks here leave no doubt as to the building being Nebuchadnezzar's; but the explorer becomes almost pathetic in his complaint that the inscriptions are in all cases identical. 'Such numerous and monotonous repetitions are very vexatious for the explorer. He would be better pleased if the texts varied on the different bricks, and afforded him an opportunity of acquiring more details of building achievements, and their nomenclature and purpose. But this desire for information on the part of later scholars was evidently not foreseen by the king of Babylon.' It is Dr. Koldewey's opinion, at present, that this Southern Citadel occupies the site of the very earliest settlement, Babilu or Babilani, the Gate of God, or Gate of the Gods.

North of the first court stands the building which the explorer inclines to identify with the famous Hanging Gardens. It presents the remains of fourteen cells, which have been roofed with strong barrel-vaulting, while one of them still contains a remarkable triple-shafted well adapted for producing a continuous flow of water. Dr. Koldewey suggests that the Hanging Gardens were raised on this vaulting and watered from this well. If so, we must revise our ideas of their splendour. Strabo and Diodorus state that the quadrangle of the gardens measured 4 plethra, or about 120 metres on a side; the actual measure is 30 metres, again exactly one-fourth. The Hanging Gardens, therefore, if this building represents them, would compare rather unfavourably with the roof-garden of an average New York hotel.

Passing westwards, a fine oblong court of 53 metres by 60 gives access to the great throne-room of the Southern Palace, the stateliest chamber so far found in Babylon. It measures 52 metres in length by 17 in breadth. 'If any one,' says Dr. Koldewey, in one of his very scarce Scripture references, 'should desire to localize the scene of Belshazzar's eventful banquet, he can surely place it with complete accuracy in this immense room.' The decoration of this chamber is striking, and enough of it has fortunately been preserved to enable a good idea to be formed of its general effect. (It should be noticed that Figs. 64 and 80 have been transposed, and that it is Fig. 80 which really represents the decoration of the throne-room). The whole area around the

throne-room belongs to Nebuchadnezzar's Palace, west of which lies that of his father Nabopolassar. Within its walls there was discovered a remarkable burial of a person who had been adorned with golden ornaments and dressed in rich gold-spangled garments. The explorer conjectures that the body may be that of Nabopolassar himself.

Between Nabopolassar's palace and the former bed of the Euphrates stands the great river-wall which Dr. Koldewey would identify with the famous 'Imgur-Bel' of Babylon, the companion wall 'Nimitti-Bel,' being in his view the inner wall of the city, whose mound still runs parallel with Procession Street at some distance east of it. The identification of Imgur-Bel is certain from bricks *in situ*, bearing the following inscription: 'Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, the exalted prince, the nourisher of Esagila and Ezida, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon am I. Since Nabopolassar, my father, my begetter, made Imgur-Bel, the great Dûr of Babylon, I, the fervent suppliant, worshipper of the Lord of lords, dug its fosses and raised its banks of asphalt and baked bricks mountain high.' In the case of the inner city-wall, the identification with Nimitti-Bel is not quite so certain, as the cylinder which gives it was not found *in situ*, and may refer to either of the double walls near which it lay.

Leaving aside the work at the principal Citadel, where excavation has scarcely done more than to indicate that there is much to be discovered, we turn to the zikurrat Etemenanki, 'the foundation-stone of Heaven and Earth,' the historic 'Tower of Babel,' whose ruins lie in the hollow called 'Sachn' or 'the Pan,' almost due south of the Kasr. Here we have an enormous enclosing wall of crude brick forming an almost perfect square. In the south-west angle of the enclosure rose a huge tower, whose core of burnt brick still survives, with a great ramp, or perhaps stairway, leading up to it from the southern side. The dimensions are gigantic. The enclosing wall measures on the east side 409 metres, and the core of the tower is 90 metres in length on a side. The peribolos wall is double, with chambers between the two components all round. On the east side, the great gate is bordered by two large buildings with open courtyards, apparently store-houses; while on the south the wall is lined with a range of large buildings which must have been priests' houses.

To the south of the enclosing wall stands the great temple of Marduk, Esagila, whose identification is rendered certain by bricks of Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal, and Nebuchadnezzar naming it. Here, then, is the whole complex of building described by Herodotus (i. 181–183). Etemenanki is what remains of his eight-staged tower; Esagila is the κάτω νηός in which stood the golden statue of 'Belus,' *i.e.* Marduk. Dr. Koldewey, however, questions very pronouncedly the general idea formed from Herodotus' description of the zikurrat as a stepped tower, formed of successive gradually diminishing storeys. 'He speaks,' says Dr. Koldewey, 'of eight towers standing one above another, but he does not say that each was smaller than the one below it. I myself desired to accept the general conception of stepped towers, but I know of no safe ground for such a conception.' The actual words of Herodotus are as follows: 'In the midst of this precinct is built a solid tower of one stade both in length and breadth, and on this tower rose another, and another upon that, to the number of eight.' The historian does not expressly state that the eight towers are arranged in successively diminishing stages; but surely that is the only possible construction. If Dr. Koldewey can find 'no safe ground' for such a conception, it may be suggested that no architect would find safe ground for the perpetration of such a monstrosity as a tower consisting of eight towers all of the same diameter, piled one upon the top of the other. The explorer should remember that Nebuchadnezzar was not building in days of steel-framed sky-scrapers. The probability is that the description of Herodotus is quite accurate, and that the universal deduction from it of a stepped tower is perfectly justified.

It is rather refreshing, however, to find Dr. Koldewey incidentally destroying another cherished illusion. He believes the summit of Etemenanki to have been used for purposes of astronomical observation, the reason for the choice of such an elevated position being the thickness of the Babylonian atmosphere! 'The greatly renowned clearness of the Babylonian sky is largely a fiction of European travellers, who are rarely accustomed to observe the night sky of Europe without the intervention of city lights.'

Space forbids more than a mention of the excavation of Epatutila, the Temple of Ninib, whose foundation cylinders bear the name of Nabopolassar, and are of historic interest because

in their inscriptions Nabopolassar specifically claims to have broken the yoke of the Assyrians from off the neck of Babylon.

It was in the mound called Merkes, which apparently covered the remains of part of the business quarter of the city, that the excavators came upon the traces of the most ancient Babylon. At a very considerable depth were found tablets, mainly business documents, with an admixture of omen literature, dating from the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon, and bearing the names of the immediate successors of Hammurabi—Samsuiluna, Ammiditana, and Samsuditana (2250 B.C.?). The seals found in Merkes, as usual in Babylonia, are of fine quality. 'Glyptic art in Babylon,' remarks Dr. Koldewey, 'is always in advance of the other contemporary plastic arts.' And then he permits himself an observation which is certainly true, but surely highly unnecessary. 'Babylonian plastic art in the round never attained the excellence of the Greek masterpieces of about the fourth century B.C.'! One rather fancies not! Neither Babylonian nor Assyrian plastic art in the round ever came within a thousand miles of even the Egyptian masterpieces of 3000 B.C., let alone Greek art of the best period. Such a statement as that of Dr. Koldewey, made with all solemnity, suggests a grave defect, either of humour or of artistic perception.

It must be admitted, however, that Dr. Koldewey has the *flair* of the genuine explorer, and a true instinct for putting two and two together. His excavations at the northern part of the mound of Homera revealed no building—nothing but a tremendous mass of débris almost entirely consisting of broken brick-work, with some Nebuchadnezzar stamps, and some Greek remains. A disappointment? Not in the least. The explorer remembered how he had been surprised at the absence of débris around the ruined core of Etemenanki. At the great tower the remains of a huge building, practically without débris; at Homera, débris without building. What could be the link between these two facts? A passage from Strabo stating that Alexander the Great intended to rebuild the tower, and spent 600,000 days' rations in having the débris removed. The mystery is solved. Homera is the débris of the Tower of Babel, and you have a link with Alexander the Great into the bargain. It is by such marshalling of his materials that the great explorer is revealed; and one can imagine something of Dr. Koldewey's gratification when the pieces of his puzzle came together so neatly.

One remark must be made about the whole volume. In his preface, Dr. Koldewey mentions the work of Rich, Layard, Oppert, and Rassam, dismissing it with the brief comment that this work is so entirely superseded by his own that it would be hardly worth while to controvert the numerous errors of the earlier explorers. That is no doubt true, though it might have been more pleasantly expressed. But in one important point Dr. Koldewey might have learnt even of these despised explorers. Some of them—Layard, for example, supremely—even Rassam, higgledy-piggledy as is his *Asshur and the Land of Nimrod*—could make their books interesting. Surely exactness need not always be purchased at the expense of vivacity. No man ever had a finer opportunity for the exercise of the historic imagination than the man who has laid bare Nebuchadnezzar's Throne-Room, the Tower of Babel, and the Procession-Street of Babylon. Yet in the whole of his volume Dr. Koldewey only permits himself one purple patch. The reader will find it on page 196; I do not quote it because its tint is so faint as only to be perceptible in the absolute colourlessness of its own surroundings. The facts of such a writer as Layard may be long since out of date; but he will always be read as the great classic of exploration, simply for the absorbing interest of his narrative. It may safely be said that no one will ever read *The Excavations at Babylon* for interest. It will always have to be read—as a record of facts; but it might have been so much more. Dr. Koldewey has missed a great opportunity, and we have still to wait for the man who will do for modern Babylonian and Assyrian exploration what Layard did for it in the forties and fifties of last century, and what Sir Gaston Maspero is still doing for the exploration of Ancient Egypt.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

By the Rev. A. H. Lemon, B.A., Wanstead.

'They took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.'

Do you know what a mimic is? If you gather all your brothers and sisters round you and play at being their schoolmaster, giving them the cane and calling them dunces and stupids, you are being a mimic, for a mimic is one who *imitates*, and you are imitating the schoolmaster. I know a minister who used to go to Scotland sometimes, and when he came back to England he used to talk like the Scotch people; he wouldn't say, 'It's a grand morning,' as we should, but, 'It's a g*rrr*and mo*rrr*ning'; (you try and say that: put your tongue to the roof of your mouth and then make a noise like an electric battery;) he was a mimic, he imitated the Scotch people, he talked *like* them. Well, other people could tell that these people had been with Jesus, because they had become *like* Him. And I'll tell you what *you* will be like if you have been with Jesus; you will be a great many things, but I want to write to you about three.

First, you will be *fragrant*. I was once walking along Hainault Road, and I heard a girl, who was selling lavender, singing something; so I said to her, 'I'll give you twopence, if you'll tell me what you're singing'; and she told me the words of her song, which were these:—

Will you buy my sweet-scented lavender,
Only sixteen full branches a penny?
You'll buy it once, you'll buy it twice,
Scent your rooms and linen nice;
Some are large and some are small,
Take them in and show them all.

Now you know what lavender smells like, don't you? It's like a hayfield and a lot of honeysuckle and some meadowsweet all mixed up together. It is fragrant. (Ask mother to put a spot of oil of lavender on your pillow at night—it will keep the mosquitoes away and will let you know what lavender smells like.) Well, there are some people who are just as fragrant as the lavender; when they come near you they make you think of flowers and the open air. Those are people who have been with Jesus.

And if you have been with Jesus you will be *fearless*. Let's have a little recitation about a four-year-old boy who was *not* fearless, shall we? Let's pretend that he's speaking:—

I 'tend that in the garden
Lives a nugly little man,
An' he always wants to catch me
If he can—if he can;
But I 'tend that I am quicker than
the nugly little man.

I 'tend he's often waiting
In the corner by the gate,
An' he creeps along the shadows,
But he's always jus' too late;
An' I 'tend he never gets me as
I'm runnin' through the gate.

I 'tend he sits and watches
In the hedge as I go by,
An' he pulls such nugly faces,
'Cos he thinks he'll make me cry;
But I 'tend I always laugh at him,
an' whistle goin' by.

An' sometimes when I'm thinkin'
Of the nugly little man,
An' it's gettin' nearly bed-time,
Then I wish I'd not began
A-'tendin' he was such a *nugly*
nugly little man.

Now that little boy was like some of us. We pretend that we never mind going up to bed in the dark, but sometimes, when grown-up people are not looking, we run up the last few steps like mad, 'just to see how quickly we can go.' But if we've been with Jesus, we shall never be frightened in the dark or anywhere else.

And if we've been with Him, we shall be *faithful*. You know that some of the towns in Holland have got dykes or banks round them and that these dykes keep out the sea; if the bank fell down, the sea would rush over the town and all

the people would be drowned; and, of course, if there is a very little hole in the bank, it has to be seen to at once, else the weight of the sea pressing on it would make it grow bigger and bigger, until it was all hole and no bank. Well, if you were a little Dutch boy, I suppose you'd wear very funny-looking trousers, and you'd know that the dykes must be kept whole. One evening a little boy was walking by himself along one of the dykes and he saw a little hole in it; he hadn't time to run and tell anybody about it, but he just put two of his little fat fingers into it and stopped it up, and he stayed there all night and went to sleep, still with his fingers in the hole; and when they found him in the morning they knew that, because he had been faithful, he had saved the town. If you have been with Jesus, you will be as faithful as he was.

I was walking along Wigram Road the other day (it was hot, Ooo! Ooo! it *was* hot), and from the house at the corner a little boy came out; I liked him because I thought he looked as though he was going to be a real man, and he had a man's name—he wasn't called Lancelot or anything like that, but just 'Jack.' Well, he came out as I passed the house, and as soon as he got out he saw a gentleman (I should think it was his grandpa); he ran to meet him, and when the gentleman saw him he said, 'Hello, Jack!' Now there are different ways of saying 'Hello!' Some boys just say ''Lo!' to each other; that means 'Don't make a fuss of me, don't want to speak to you.' But this gentleman said 'Hello!' as if he was saying 'Hooray!'—that's the proper way to say it. And just after he had said 'Hello, Jack!' a little girl (Jack's sister) came running along the pavement because she'd heard grandpa speaking; she was very excited because she had neither shoes nor stockings on, and she started telling her grandpa about it very quickly; and as soon as he saw her, he said, 'Hello, Babs!' in just the same hooray-way. Now what I want you to understand is that when you go out of the house in the morning, Jesus comes to meet you and He does not say to you, 'Now, Marjorie, can you say the Lord's Prayer?' He does not say, 'Now, Leslie, can you tell me the names of the twelve disciples?' Although you can't see Him, He comes quickly up to you and says just 'Hello, Marjorie!' 'Hello, Leslie!' just like that grandpa did. And if you can get to know how much He loves you and that He understands how to talk to boys and girls better than any one else does, you will *be* with Jesus, and you will become fragrant, fearless, and faithful.

II.

March Winds.

'And God made a wind to pass over the earth.'—Gn 8^{1}.

There is a lovely story of George MacDonald's called *At the Back of the North Wind.* It is about a little boy who slept in a bed in a stable loft, and was annoyed by the wind blowing through a hole in the boards near his head. He stopped it up with a cork, but when he was in bed the cork was blown out all of a sudden, and next minute there was a beautiful creature by him, a fairy all covered with rippling tresses of hair. She carried him with her over hill and dale, riding, oh, how deliciously soft and warm, and night after night these airy pilgrimages went on while she taught him how everything in the world was bound together by love and care.

Now, we are given a singularly beautiful touch in this Bible story of Noah. I wonder if you boys and girls have ever noticed it. Noah must have been lonely in that ark of his. I believe when he looked out and realized that he alone, and they that were with him in the ark, remained alive, he went down to the depths of despair. God did not come and comfort him at once, however. He made *a wind* to pass over the earth. There would probably be no hole in the ark through which it might whistle; but doubtless something about it spoke to Noah of 'God's love and care.' The Bible story runs—'God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that was with him in the ark; and God made a wind to pass over the earth and the waters assuaged.'

The winds whistle about us still—especially in March. Don't you girls storm at them, when you get your hats blown off, and your hair all tossed about. The boys like wind, I know. They throw off their caps so that their heads may get the full benefit of it. And grown men—they have head-aches sometimes, and feel so miserable, that like petted children they cry to God for comfort, then God often treats them just as He treated Noah; he sends a wind.

Why, my boys and girls, God's wind can work miracles. In the spring-time it makes hearts feel very young.

Hush-a-by, baby, on the tree-top,
When the wind blows the cradle will rock,
When the bough breaks the cradle will fall,
Down will come baby, cradle, and all.

I have heard a mother sing that to her first-born on a windy day. There was such happiness on her face—it was like the face of a little girl. And when George MacDonald, who wrote *At the Back of the North Wind*, felt a spring wind, his mind became full of very beautiful thoughts. Here are some verses from one of his poems about it:

A gentle wind of western birth
On some far summer sea,
Wakes daisies in the wintry earth,
Wakes hopes in wintry me.
. . . . . .
The north wind blows, and blasts, and raves,
And flaps his snowy wing:
Back! toss thy bergs on arctic waves;
Thou canst not bar our spring.

Up comes the primrose wondering;
The snowdrop droopeth by;
The holy spirit of the spring
Is working silently.
. . . . . .
Blow on me, wind, from west and south;
Sweet summer spirit blow!
Come like a kiss from dear child's mouth,
Who knows not what I know.

It is all very beautiful. But I have noticed this: when a boy or girl—a boy especially—tries to put the wind into a picture, he thinks of a cruel, wild, stormy wind that blows down chimney-stalks, and sends ships to the bottom of the sea. That is, so far, as it should be; I like the idea. My dear boys and girls, we big folks know that no one gets any great happiness in this life that has not some sorrow bound up with it; and there is a very sorrowful side to the story of the wind.

I want to read a few more verses of poetry to you. They are by a singer who loved God and thought about Him a great deal. Her name, girls—we must not let the boys have all the honour—was Christina Rossetti.

The wind has such a rainy sound
Moaning through the town,
The sea has such a windy sound,—
Will the ships go down?
The apples in the orchard
Tumble from their tree.—
Oh will the ships go down, go down,
In the windy sea?
. . . . . .
I have a little husband
And he is gone to sea;
The winds that whistle round his ship
Fly home to me.

Christina Rossetti believed that people could meet God in the wind. She felt, as the little boy in the hay-loft learnt to feel—that everything and everybody was bound together by God's love. Somehow too the dreaminess of the wind made her happy. She loved it with the love of the poet.

'Twist me a crown of wind-flowers;
(she sang)
That I may fly away
To hear the singers at their song,
And players at their play.'

'Put on your crown of wind-flowers;
But whither would you go?'
'Beyond the surging of the sea
And the storms that blow.'

Then she remembered about God, her Father, being the only reality:

'Alas! your crown of wind-flowers
Can never make you fly:
I twist them in a crown to-day,
And to-night they die.'

My boys and girls, when you feel the March winds blow, will you remember that the wind may be a sacred thing, and that God sends it to comfort His sick children, that mothers sing about it, that sometimes it brings great sadness, but above all, that it helps to make this world beautiful and full of joy?

The wind whistles and we may try to shut it out from us, but like God's goodness it comes all round about us—we cannot escape from it. You will love the March winds now, won't you?

III.

It is a particular pleasure to receive another volume of talks to boys and girls from the Rev. Will Reason, M.A., and to receive it so soon after the previous volume. It proves that it is possible

for a man to preach a good children's sermon every Sunday. For this volume, of which the title is *The Knight and the Dragon* (Scott; 2s. net), is quite as good as the other, and it was very good indeed. Here is one of the talks.

The Truth that was a Lie.

During the great Civil War in America, there was a fight in a part of the country covered with woods. Among the trees it is very easy to get separated from your own people, and it happened that an officer of the Northern Army found himself a prisoner in the hands of a squad of the enemy. But while he was waiting to see what would be done next, he overheard his captors talking, and discovered that they too had become separated from their regiment, and did not even know in which direction to go to find it. When they could not make up their minds, he heard them say, 'Let us ask this Yankee. Of course he will tell us a lie, but we can go the other way to the one he points out.'

When they came to him, therefore, and asked him the question, he was very careful to point in exactly the direction in which he knew that their regiment was, and as they marched off with him the other way, he very soon found himself among his own men and free, while they were prisoners.

Some people have argued a great deal as to whether the officer really told the truth or not, and others as to whether in war it is not allowable to tell lies to the enemy. 'If you fight with swords and guns,' they say, 'why not with your tongue as well?'

But I think that the more important thing is to see that truth is more than a matter of words, and that war is all the more horrible that it is very difficult to speak the truth to each other when each is suspecting the other of doing all the mischief that he can. Men are, I hope and believe, beginning to see that if we really want truth and right done upon the earth, war is one of the very silliest ways of going about it.

You know that nowadays, by means of wireless telegraphy, messages can be sent from a ship in distress to others that may be a very long way off, and that by its means very many people have of late been saved from shipwrecks and fire at sea. What happens is that the instrument sends out a kind of electric wave of a certain length, through what is called the ether, and that makes the instrument on the ship that receives the message work. But before this can take place, the two instruments have to be tuned together, as it is called. The one that receives must be adjusted so as to take the exact length of wave that the other sends out.

It is something like that when people speak the truth to each other. The one must be able to say, and the other must be able to understand the truth, or at best they get into a muddle, and at worst a great deal of mischief is done.

First of all, in speaking the truth, you must use words that other people understand in the same sense as you do. Sometimes quite small boys and girls get into trouble because they use words without fully understanding all that they mean. A little girl was once heard by her mother to say, 'I wish everybody was dead.' Now, that sounded shocking, and it is quite possible that that little girl might have had a good scolding and perhaps been punished, if she had not had a wise mother who understood something about little children. Instead of punishing her, the mother asked her questions, and found out that this little girl knew nothing of death, as we do when we grow older. But she had seen some beautifully coloured leaves, which people called dead, and what she really meant was that she would like every one to be beautiful! Sometimes, too, older people make queer blunders when they are learning a new language. I have heard a missionary tell how he thought he was saying 'Beloved brethren' or some such endearing words to his congregation, but all the while he was calling them tigers!

But even when you think you are speaking the same language, it is useful to be sure that the other people mean the same thing that you do, and that is why you ought to be careful to speak exactly, and as simply as you can. That is the first thing to remember in speaking the truth.

But there is still the other side of it: how to understand the truth which some one is trying to tell you. Those soldiers in the story were deceived, although the officer told them the exact truth, and there was no question about the words he used. They received a lie, because between them there was no understanding of the heart. They expected to be lied to, and so they were.

This is very important when we are reading what Jesus said, and, indeed, what is said in the Bible generally, and also in any good book. How-

ever plain the words are, they do not tell us the full truth unless we are of the right spirit to receive it. Very often people make up their minds first what they want to believe, and then pick out words from the Bible that seem to back them up. So they have often quarrelled about the truth, and thrown texts at each other. That is not at all the way to learn the truth. Jesus said that it was the spirit in ourselves that we needed, and then the spirit in His words would speak to us.

That is what many of us have found, and what we want you boys and girls to find. If you keep asking God to make you want what He wants, and to see things more as He sees them, you will find that some of Jesus' words will speak to you so that you are quite sure of them in your heart, and as you go on trying to trust Him and do as He says, other sayings, that had not meant much to you before, will be just alive with meaning. In a way, you believe them now, because He said them. I dare say you would believe me if I told you that the three angles of a triangle were equal to two of the angles of a square, just because you know that I have learnt more than you. I expect that some of you have seen that to be true for yourselves already, while the rest of you just listen politely. It is like that with the truth that Jesus wants to teach us. Many people listen politely to Him, but they do not really receive the truth, because they have not yet enough of His spirit to understand it. When they have, it comes home to them. But so long as we are selfish, we cannot receive it.

'Not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.'

In Praise of Faith.

A STUDY OF HEBREWS xi. 1, 6, xii. 1, 2.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London.

II.

(1) The reason for Enoch's translation, according to the writer of the Epistle, was that he had been 'well-pleasing unto God' ('*he had satisfied God*,' Moffatt); and what satisfied God in him was his faith. The writer justifies the inference by the general proposition that 'without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto him' ('*to satisfy him*,' Moffatt). What gives faith its *value* is that it is just what God wants from man; and God's requirement is not unreasonable or arbitrary because of the nature of faith itself: 'he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him' ('*the man who draws near to God must believe that he exists, and that he does reward those who seek him*,' Moffatt). This account of the content of faith in v.[6] corresponds with the description of the function of faith in the first verse.

'The unseen must be treated as sufficiently demonstrated, and the hoped-for reward must be considered substantial' (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*, iv. p. 354). The relation between God and man is mutual, on man's side there must be an approach to God in worship (τὸν προσερχόμενον, cf. 7[25]), and a strenuous endeavour (τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν) in service. But both worship and service of God imply faith, not only belief in God's existence, although that there must be, but belief that God responds to man's approach as a rewarder (μισθαποδότης). Faith treats the invisible God as real, and the future good as certain.

(2) At first sight we seem here to be moving in the region of legalism, and not of the gospel. But we must, in the *first place*, remember that in this chapter the writer is dealing with the heroes of faith under the old covenant, and that it would be an anachronism for him in this context to present to us the distinctive faith under the new covenant. *Secondly*, in the instances of faith which he gives it is generally trust in the fulfilment of God's promises which is commanded. It is not righteousness of works, but 'the righteousness which is according to faith' (v.[7]), that is characteristic of these heroes of faith. When, *thirdly*, we go beyond the bounds of this chapter even the appearance of legalism vanishes. In 7[25], where

the same word is used for the approach to God in worship (τοὺς προσερχομένους), Christ is the way. 'Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.' And in 12^{7} God is represented not as lawgiver, judge, or ruler, but as Father who in the chastening even deals with men as sons, and makes that chastening even a proof of His fatherly care. In view of these considerations, we are warranted in our study of the value of faith, under the guidance of this estimate of it, to go in our thought beyond what the words of the writer taken literally suggest, as he himself is here appropriately to the context giving us only a partial representation, the inadequacy of which is elsewhere corrected.

(3) It is evident that in the relation between God and man it rests with God to determine the attitude which He assumes to man, and the attitude He requires of man. When we speak of man as drawing near, or as seeking God, and of God only as the rewarder, we are in danger of at least appearing to assign the initiative to man. I have heard a responsible theologian say that in all other religions man has been seeking God without finding Him; and that in Christianity alone has God so sought man as to be found of him. But I prefer to hold with my revered teacher, Dr. Fairbairn, that religion implies revelation, and that man seeks God, because he is being sought by God, that he comes to God as God draws him. While the desire and the effort of man after God are from God, yet what man is conscious of is his own seeking and striving, and not God's drawing. How variously men have striven and sought after God! As in the previous section we turned to animism for an illustration of the universal and permanent function of faith, so may we now turn to Hinduism for an illustration of the ways in which men have tried to worship and serve the divine. Hindu piety recognizes three kinds of approach, the *jnana marga*, the *karma marga*, and the *bhakti marga*. By knowledge, sacrifice, and devotion has the Hindu saint sought the divine. He turned to the last of the three ways because he could not find his soul's satisfaction by either of the other two. And the Hindu *bhakti* has a resemblance, though remote, to Christian faith.

(4) In the Hebrew nation the popular religion sought to please or to appease Yahveh by the multitude and value of its sacrifices. 'Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, as with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?' The prophet's answer to this question is: 'He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy,' and to walk humbly with thy God?' (Mic 6^{6-8}). And there can be no doubt that the *doing justly* and the *loving mercy*, in the prophet's view, would follow on the *walking humbly with God*; and that the walking humbly with God would involve contrition and confidence of heart, penitence from sin, and faith in God. Hosea declares God's will for man in the words, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings' (6^{6}). The Hebrew word חֶסֶד, *khesedh*, means 'dutiful love,' whether to God or man; while the parallelism requires the first reference, the context would suggest the second; but the two senses are not mutually exclusive, but organically related. He who is devoted to God will be kind to man. Jesus on two distinct occasions quotes the first clause against His critics (Mt 9^{13} and 12^{7}).

(5) While Pharisaic Judaism sought justification by the deeds of the law, Paul preached the gospel of justification by faith, for he had himself discovered to his own despair the impossibility of the former, and to his own salvation the reality of the latter. And he had the warrant of Jesus' teaching as well as his own experience. Jesus did call men to penitence and faith; and the first was possible only when the second was actual. Faith in God's grace, as in the sinful woman, moved to repentance of sin. As we shall see in the next section, Jesus Himself is the supreme instance of the life of faith which is well-pleasing unto God.

(6) For this pre-eminence of faith in religion there are two reasons, one subjective as regards man, and one objective as regards God. (i.) The way of *Knowledge* can be attempted only by the few. 'Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?' (Job 11^{7}). This is a challenge which the majority of mankind cannot take up. And those who attempt the quest end either in despair of it,

or in a 'vaulting ambition that o'erleaps itself.' What could be more cheerless than the Hindu sage's attempt to lose his own consciousness in Brahma? What more pathetic, if not ridiculous, than the pretension of the Hegelian philosophy that the Absolute Idea has reached its highest stage of development in philosophy? It is not then by the *jnana marga* that mankind can hope to reach the relation to God for which it is fit, and which it needs.

Neither can the *karma marga* assure man of God's favour. What offering can be costly enough, what number of gifts can be sufficient, if God be thought of as needing to be thus propitiated? Man cannot command the resources to make sure of God's favour by satisfying Him with gifts. Again, can any man be good enough to claim as a right God's approval and reward? The more earnest a man is about the moral task, the more hopeless will any such attempt appear to him. If it be objected that a man may bring even his small offering with confidence, because he believes that God of His grace will accept it, or he may make his feeble endeavours after goodness, because he believes that God, knowing man's weakness, will of His grace not expect too much from him, already the ground of offerings and works has been abandoned, and it is faith that is the reason for any assurance of God's favour which may thus be gained. Belief, and trust in God, and consequent believing and trustful surrender to God is possible, if difficult to the wise and prudent, if they will humble themselves as children; and it is the only way open to 'the babes,' the poor, the weak, the unworthy. On man's side, then, faith is the sole possibility for man's universal approach and appeal to God.

(ii.) But it is also the only appropriate response of man to God as He has revealed Himself. Even as Creator, God claims man's dependence on Himself, and in prayer and sacrifice, where offered in a recognition of such dependence, there is implicit faith that God can and will protect and provide. Still more, if we think of God as Jesus did, and has taught us to do, must faith appear the one activity of man which can be well-pleasing to God. The Father desires above all the trust of His children, their dependence on Him, confidence in Him, and submission to Him. How inadequate the relation of knowledge in comparison with the relation of faith, which exercises the whole personality. How presumptuous the relation of knowledge as though man could so know God as to know Him fully as He is! How hopeless the enterprise of worship or works which does not find its motive in the conviction that God is gracious and wants to save and bless! How sufficient, appropriate, and satisfying on the contrary is the relation of faith between the perfect God and men as His dependent creatures and beloved children through His goodness and His grace. Faith gives God, and not man, the initiative in the relation. It is receptivity for and responsiveness to God's activity to do good and to show mercy. It recognizes man's insufficiency and God's sufficiency. It magnifies the difference between God and man, and so emphasizes the condescension of God to man. It both humbles and exalts man, and the humility is not craven, and the exaltation is not proud. It claims nothing for man except as God gives it; and it yields to God as of God all that is good in man. Man for it is great only as God makes him great by the generosity of His grace.

(7) Having shown reason why faith is the only appropriate attitude of man to God, as alone corresponding to God's attitude to man, we may glance at the writer's description of the content of faith. There is belief in God's existence, and in God's rewarding those who seek Him. (i.) Although we sometimes use the word belief to indicate the intellectual activity in faith, yet, as the whole context shows, no such restricted meaning can be here assigned, for the heroes of faith here mentioned gave practical effect to this belief. They trusted in God's promises, and fulfilled God's commands. To take only one instance. 'By faith Abraham, when he was called, obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance; and he went out, not knowing whither he went' (v.[8]). There is here confidence in and committal unto God, as well as conviction about God. Emotion and action were correspondent with and consequent on the conception about God. These believers felt and did as they believed; and faith is complete only as it inspires trust and constrains obedience. (ii.) But even belief as one aspect of faith is not an intellectual activity alone. Belief is both less and more than knowledge. (*a*) Belief is a knowledge which cannot be fully verified. When I have sensible evidence of an object, or logical demonstration of a thesis, I know it, and do not simply believe it, even if the

knowledge does involve a belief in the trustworthiness of my senses and my understanding. Of God's existence and of His relation to men either in justice or in grace, I have neither sensible evidence nor logical demonstration. In the experience and character which result from belief, there may be reached such a verification of it as raises the object of it from probability to certainty, and we may claim that for moral insight and spiritual discernment belief in has become knowledge of God. But this is a personal conquest, and not a general possession. (*b*) Belief is also more than knowledge. 'We cannot refer belief,' says Croom Robertson, 'to any one phase of mind. It is an essentially complex mental state, describable in every one of the three phases—a mode of representative intellection, tinged with feeling, having relation to the native tendency, to act' (*Elements of General Philosophy*, p. 90). In belief in God the sentiment of dependence and reverence, the sense of worth which accompanies the belief, moves to the choice of the will, its decision that the belief is true, that it does correspond to reality. To believe in God, that there is a wise mind, a loving heart, and a holy will in all, through all, over all, as ultimate cause, essential reality, and final purpose in the Universe, is not the result of sensible evidence or logical demonstration; it is a decision of the whole personality as to the supreme value of truth, love, holiness. Accordingly, even the belief in God's existence is not a mere intellectual process; it exhibits because it results from the personal qualities in man, through which, as like God's, he can have personal fellowship with God, and accordingly in itself it has moral and religious value. It is in these respects more than knowledge.

(8) While the belief in God's existence even has this moral and religious value, still more has the belief in God as the rewarder of them that seek after Him. It need not be taken at all in a legalistic, Pharisaic interpretation. All the instances of faith which follow even exclude such an interpretation. It is no immediate temporal good that is gained by faith, but one that the selfish and the worldly would not desire or expect. The writer sees even in the reward believed in something more heavenly and less earthly than a strictly historical view would allow (vv. 10, 13–16), and insists that none did actually obtain the reward. For all God's promise remained unfulfilled, 'These all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect' (v. 40). He thus himself points us to the ultimate object of faith, of which all proximate objects, which never did or could give final satisfaction, were but the promise. It is the revelation of God and the redemption of man that is the substance of all that which the heroes of faith under the old covenant looked, suffered, and sought for was but the shadow. Faith attains its moral and spiritual maturity only in relation to the object in which culminates God's relation to and dealing with man: and the value of the faith corresponds with the value of its object, the finality of the truth, the sufficiency of the grace, and the certainty of the good, which is received by man in Jesus Christ.

Contributions and Comments.

Where did Paul speak at Athens?

When two rival and violently divergent views hold the field on a subject so central in the public eye as St. Paul's speech at Athens, it would seem to be a piece of gratuitous impertinence to suggest a third interpretation. I should neither care nor dare to do so, did not an ancient tradition, which has not, so far as I know, come to the notice of Protestant writers, give support to the theory here unfolded.

The question rages, of course, round the question, 'Where did Paul speak?' The normal view of English writers, expounded and defended with great clarity by the Rev. A. Findlay (*Annual of the British School at Athens*, 1894–1895), is that he spoke on the hilltop whither he was led (from the agora, the market-place) by those who wished to hear him in quiet. Curtius, however, followed with vigour by so great an authority as Sir William Ramsay (*St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, pp. 243–249), maintains that he made the speech

where he had already been disputing, *i.e.* in the agora itself, possibly going to the Stoa Basileios (the royal arcade), which stood at the north end of the market, to be heard by the members of the court of the Areopagus, though not in their judicial capacity, and by the philosophers, with the general public standing round. Sir William Ramsay suggests that the court had power to admit 'university lecturers' and, in this capacity, was giving Paul a tentative hearing.

The ground for discussion arises principally through the double meaning of the word Areopagus, which is used twice in the account given in Ac 17. Does 'Areopagus' mean the hill (as translated in the Authorized Version, v.[22]), or the body of men who constituted the court? It is certain that the word was commonly used to signify either; but in which sense does Luke use it?

He tells us that Paul was led to the Areopagus (v.[19]) and that Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus (v.[22]). Mr. Findlay (as the ablest exponent of the hill theory) says that this means that the philosophers—being inquisitive and scenting a novel philosophy, and perhaps (we may add) with an anticipation of doing some heckling—took Paul by the hand and led him to the actual session-place of the Areopagus on the top of the hill itself. It was not a formal trial at all, but a break in the routine of discussing their thread-worn philosophic themes.

Curtius and Sir William Ramsay object that the hilltop, exposed and wind-swept, is a most unsuitable place for a speech, to which Mr. Findlay retorts that the wind does not always blow, and, in any case, the hill was used regularly by the court of the Areopagus for its sittings, and could not therefore be so unsuitable.

Reading the controversy in Athens, and walking over and round the rocky hill itself, I was reduced to despair. For the objections on both sides seemed so well founded that neither view seemed to be possible. Standing on the hilltop and trying to put oneself in the position of an Athenian of the first century, it appeared to me perfectly incredible that they would bring Paul to that spot. They had just called him a 'Smatterer' (the word used by Luke was an Athenian slang expression indicating a loafer who picked up odd bits). They led him in a spirit of inquisitive expectancy, critical and tinged with disdain. Yet this hilltop was simply saturated with the profoundest religious and civic awe. Not only was it the seat of the court, but within twenty feet was the cleft of the Semnai (the goddesses of the under-world), round which a thousand associations of worship and reverence hung. And this same cleft was the burial-place of Œdipus himself, the great king whose very bones were said to make the side of the Acropolis before which they lay impregnable. To take Paul there would be (from the Athenian point of view) like some Oxford dons taking a more than usually clever and arresting street orator off his box under the Martyrs' Memorial and leading him into the Sheldonian Theatre to speak.

Yet it seems just as difficult to accept the other view that they stayed in the market-place, where the chaffering of commerce and the perpetual movement would be so continuous that—although an argument might be carried on quite easily—a set speech would seem impossible. And the strength of Luke's Greek is all in the direction of a more definite move to a quieter spot than the conjectured Stoa Basileios. Whither, then?

I was prowling round and over the hill and came down, by a set of ancient rock-hewn steps, to an artificially cut place on the north side of the hill. It is a sloping plateau, facing on to the site of the Greek agora, seventy-two paces from end to end and forty-seven in depth. The whole back of it is one artificially cut wall in the native rock some twelve to fourteen feet high. In the centre of this wall is cut a rough deep cross as tall as a man. A Greek boy, who was playing in this sheltered spot, saw me looking at the cross, and, pointing to it, he uttered the one word 'Paolos.'

The Greek Church has an immemorial tradition —which has apparently escaped the notice of our British writers on St. Paul—that he was led from the agora to this sheltered plateau, which is both in and on the Areopagus rock.[1] This is, of course, tradition. It is nothing more, but it is nothing less. Those who know most of research in the Eastern Mediterranean coasts know how extraordinarily tenacious the unwritten traditions of the Greek Church are, and how often they give the clue that leads to the discovery of lost sites.

[1] For this information I am indebted to Dr. (Miss) Kalopathakes, who combines the intimate local knowledge of a native Athenian with the trained, detached mind of a Harvard graduate, and who possesses all the archæological instincts and learning of one who has followed the whole development of research—German, American, and British —in personal contact with the great excavators.

Tradition is here reinforced by topography, that element which the class-room expositor may so easily and perilously neglect. The plateau is the nearest point on the hill to the practically certain site of the Greek agora. Acoustically it is ideal for open-air speaking—having a formation similar to that of the Pnyx, Demosthenes' great open-air platform. Incidentally one may mention that the sun goes off the plateau very early, which is not so trivial as it may seem, in view of the fact that Paul was in Athens about August, and possibly in September, when the city literally broils. 'The shadow of a rock' would be found there.

Such a place might well be a kind of ante-chamber of the Areopagus court, being situated on the side of the Areopagus hill itself, and, indeed, lying directly between the Greek agora and the sacred height. The rock-hewn steps, mentioned already, lead up from this plateau to the high official session-place, which is about a hundred and thirty paces south-east of the plateau and from thirty to forty feet higher. It would, therefore, be a singularly suitable spot for an unofficial meeting of the Areopagites at which non-Areopagite philosophers were present, and where cultivated and uncultivated loungers formed the background—a background which quite clearly had a large place in Paul's consciousness. To place the meeting in this spot retains that air of free public discussion which belongs to the story and yet is lost on the hilltop; while it is without the difficulties which the agora theory presents. Further, it allows the word 'Areopagus' to have that double meaning, of the hill and the body of men, which properly belonged to it in the everyday speech of Athens. An interpretation which is thus supported by tradition and topography, and is consistent with the text, is submitted for examination by competent expositors and archæologists. But the examination, to be adequate, should be made on the spot.

BASIL MATHEWS.

London.

Devendranath Tagore.

I WISH to say something about the note in the January number on the *Autobiography of Devendranath Tagore*. From the chapter quoted it appears unquestionable that Tagore found God, or was found by Him; and as we read we are ready to exclaim with St. Peter, 'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.' But no sooner have we reached this conclusion than we are invited to turn the page, and to see in this man a bitter enemy of Christian missions, and are reminded of the solemn words of Christ Himself: 'No man cometh unto the Father, but by me.' And the question is asked, What can we make of it? May I try to answer?

(1) Of Tagore's hostility to missions, and his desire to check their progress, let two things be said. In the first place, this no doubt marks the incompleteness of the revelation he has received. He is still where Cornelius was before St. Peter's visit—*on the way to the Son through the Father*. And in the second place, the tone in which some missionary writers have been known to speak of Roman missions in India, and propound plans to frustrate their success, ought to remind us that the argument from Tagore's feeling about missions cannot bear much weight.

(2) 'No man cometh unto the Father, but by me.' Here the ground is more difficult, and I venture to express my view with some hesitation. If 'me' here denotes Jesus of Nazareth, the Divine historical Person who revealed the Father by His life, death, and resurrection, then it seems at first sight as if we were driven to the conclusion that Tagore cannot have 'come to the Father.'

But are we bound to restrict the denotation of 'me' in this way? Does it not denote not only the historical manifestation of the Divine Word, but also the Divine Word Himself, by whom all things were made, who 'is' before Abraham? Are we required to believe that since the Incarnation God no more utters His Word 'in divers manners'? Is it possible to deny the fact of His operation in any particular person on the ground that such person has not yet comprehended His historical manifestation? Surely it was by the Word that Cornelius was led, and Saul prepared for his vision, that Plato, in his highest moments, saw and spoke, and Marcus Aurelius hungered. And by that same Word, though not yet recognized in His manifestation as Jesus of Nazareth, may we not believe that Devendranath Tagore was enlightened, because He is 'the true Light, which lighteth every man'?

R. SOMERVELL.

Harrow-on-the-Hill.

The Elberfeld Horses.

With reference to the review of Maeterlinck's article on the Elberfeld horses, Mr. Rawson in *Life Understood* has dealt with the dog 'Rolf,' and the instances of the answers this dog gave by an alphabet composed of taps of his foot to even theological questions, put the Elberfeld horses in the shade. It is worth while repeating one portion of what Mr. Rawson says, as it is very amusing and confirms what the article in The Expository Times says:—

'Some of the stories told about this dog are very amusing. In Mr. Del Re's letter Rolf's aptitude for figures was mentioned. It is related of the dog by Dr. Mackenzie that Madame Moekel, having cause to suspect one of her children of getting help from someone in doing his sums, and not being able to get a satisfactory answer from the child himself, determined to watch the children while doing their lessons. The result was quite unexpected. The two youngest children were seated with the dog, and hardly had they heard their mother draw near than they pushed him violently away, exclaiming, "Be off, Rolf, here's Mamma!" All three, said Madame Moekel, had the air of guilty persons taken in the act. The admission of the culprits confirmed the suspicions of the lady: the children made Rolf do their sums for them!'

Mr. Rawson in *Life Understood* clears up the scientific reason for all forms of occult phenomena, and shows to what this apparent intelligence of horses and dogs is due.

His book shows that Maeterlinck's suggestion that the intelligence of animals 'is not conscious intelligence, but only subconscious or subliminal,' is perfectly correct; and, what is of more importance, he shows how every man by true prayer can obtain the advantage of the knowledge possessed by the subconscious mind. He shows the two methods by which this knowledge can be obtained: one harmful to the worker, namely, by deadening the conscious mind, as is done by hypnotism, spiritualism, use of drugs, etc.; the other, conscious right thinking in the way that Jesus Christ taught and demonstrated.

D. H. Edwards.

London.

Entre Nous.

The offer is made of a complete set (20 vols.) of *The Great Texts of the Bible* (or the equivalent in other books chosen from T. & T. Clark's Catalogue) for the best series of illustrations from the War, suitable for pulpit or platform. The illustrations should be sent in February.

The illustrations need not be copied out. Papers, periodicals, or clippings may be sent But the topic or text illustrated should be clearly marked, *and the source and date should be stated.*

Quite above the ordinary day-book in pith and point is the Rev. W. J. Pearce's book *Old Gems Reset* (Bennett; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Pearce quotes a text of Scripture, and a sentence of Thomas à Kempis agreeing with it, and then he gives his illuminating exposition. Here is an example.

The Inner Ear.

'The ears of them that hear shall hearken.'
Is. xxxii. 3.

'Mind these things, O my soul, and shut the door of thy senses, that thou mayst hear what the Lord thy God speaks within thee.'
Thomas à Kempis, Book III. ch. i.

We can hear with the heart what we cannot hear with the ear, but we cannot hear with the heart what we *refuse* to hear with the ear. The ear that declines the information, counsel, and correction of the Word and Will of God cannot receive the knowledge of salvation, of remission of sins, and of eternal life. 'The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, they are foolishness unto him, and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' The well is deep, and he has nothing to draw with: Heaven is high, he cannot attain unto it, he has no ladder; an acceptance of the Truth there must be, before there can be an experience of the Way. As long as the ears are 'dull of hearing,' and man is deaf to the calls and appeals of God, so long his heart remains *gross*, unimpressed by that which is spiritual and Divine. Man must open 'the door of the soul'

—as the ear has been so aptly called by the old Puritan writers—before Christ, the Living, Life-giving Word, can enter. When that word, even 'the Truth as it is in Jesus,' is heard with a diligent hearkening, then shall the soul, in a feast which the Heavenly Guest always brings with Him, 'delight itself in fatness.' When by such acceptance of His word, His floor is thoroughly cleansed; when the work of expelling His foes is complete; when He, who has stood waiting at the *door* to be heard and admitted; when God comes into His own, then He can and will pour His love into our inner ear, make known His secret, and 'commune as friend with friend.' The gifts He has then to impart to us can be received, because He has His rightful place. In the still small voice which quiets the murmur and the sigh, which restores the quiet of the soul, God imparts to the inner ear, with the free consent and desire of our own will—the fruits and favours of His world-wide purposes of grace and love.

If our hearts are burdened with a great fear or sorrow, or torn with the bitter agony of blasted hopes, we must not expect God to hear us before we hear Him. It is hard to shut the door of our senses to sights and sounds that appeal so clearly and loudly to the human nature so prone to walk by sight and sound, rather than by faith, but it is only thus that we can hear with the inner ear of spiritual understanding, His promise. 'Whoso putteth his trust in the Lord, he shall be safe'; 'Trust in the Lord at all times, and (then) pour out your hearts before him.' The intercommunion of the trustful heart with God knows no space between the source and the need. The Heaven of condition, where God sits enthroned—established in a mutual confidence, permits of no barrier and no distance between the Omnipotent and the suppliant. *The Word*—of encouragement, hope, life, *is nigh thee, even in thy heart.*

Open, Lord, my inner ear,
And bid my heart rejoice;
Bid my quiet spirit hear
Thy comfortable voice:
Never in the whirlwind found,
Or where earthquakes rock the place;
Still and silent is the sound;
The whisper of Thy grace.

A Unitarian Anthology.

A Book of Daily Strength (Lindsey Press; 3s. 6d. net), by V. D. Davis, B.A., is a selection of well-expressed ideas on God and religion by Unitarian writers. The quotations are arranged under texts that are appropriate, and there is a page of the book for every day's reading in the year. Here, for example, is a quotation from Frederick H. Hedge, giving a good place to piety: 'The world's heroes are not unworthy the homage they receive on their own plane. Whatever savours of heroism is worthy of honour. All great and shining qualities, strength, valour, genius—who can help admiring these! I rejoice that such things are; I rejoice that there is power in man to appreciate such. Still, there is something greater than these; they do not exhaust the power that is in man. The piety which dwells in the heights of the soul, which walks and works with God in godlike beneficence, is more sublime than the valour which breasts the shock of armies, than the genius which walks in glory among the stars.'

New Poetry.

Wilfrid Scawen Blunt.

It is thirty years since *The Sonnets of Proteus* were published. Mr. Blunt has never astonished the world again. One of the sonnets (we shall quote it for all its familiarity) became quite famous, and made its author famous. Eighteen years ago W. E. Henley and Sir George Wyndham made a selection from the poetry, and called the book they published *The Poetry of Wilfrid Blunt.* Mr. Blunt did not approve of the selection. He did not approve of the making of a selection at all, and he does not approve now. So he has himself edited the whole of his poetical works, and they have been issued by Messrs. Macmillan in two highly pleasing volumes under the title of *The Poetical Works of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt.*

A list of Mr. Blunt's published volumes is given at the beginning of the first volume. They are twelve in number, not counting the present complete edition, and they have ranged over the years from 1875 to 1903. The complete edition opens with 'Esther,' which was not published till 1892. In placing it first the poet seems to say that it contains his theory of life — that very protest against the conventional theory of life which reduced Henley and Wyndham to leave out as many poems when they published their selection.

After 'Esther' come 'The Love Sonnets of Proteus,' of which we shall quote the sonnet that

is to carry him to immortality. After that another poem of a different strain will serve to illustrate his manner in religion.

LAUGHTER AND DEATH.

There is no laughter in the natural world
Of beast or fish or bird, though no sad doubt
Of their futurity to them unfurled
Has dared to check the mirth-compelling shout.
The lion roars his solemn thunder out
To the sleeping woods. The eagle screams her cry.
Even the lark must strain a serious throat
To hurl his blest defiance at the sky.
Fear, anger, jealousy have found a voice.
Love's pain or rapture the brute bosoms swell.
Nature has symbols for her nobler joys,
Her nobler sorrows. Who had dared foretell
That only man, by some sad mockery,
Should learn to laugh, who learns that he must die?

THE TWO VOICES.

There are two voices with me in the night,
Easing my grief. The God of Israel saith,
'I am the Lord thy God which vanquisheth.
See that thou walk unswerving in my sight,
So shall thy enemies thy footstool be.
I will avenge.' Then wake I suddenly,
And, as a man new armoured for the fight,
I shout aloud against my enemy.

Anon, another speaks, a voice of care
With sorrow laden and akin to grief,
'My son,' it saith, 'What is my will with thee?
The burden of my sorrows thou shalt share.
With thieves thou too shalt be accounted thief,
And in my kingdom thou shalt sup with me.'

Franklin Henry Giddings.

Why does Mr. Giddings call his book of poetry *Pagan Poems* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). This is the reason he gives: 'The title is chosen not with irreligious intent—quite the contrary. It is chosen to emphasize that inextinguishable "faith in the possibilities of life" which has come down to us through all the religions of the world, from the earliest fears and hopes of the human heart, the earliest questionings of the human mind.' Is this a pagan poem?

TO MARGARET.

Don't be afraid, my little maid,
Of a saint, or a devil or two;
But don't be afraid to be afraid,
If the devil is bigger than you.

George Mackaye.

Mr. Percy Mackaye, the author of *The Present Hour* (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net), is an American poet who has found himself much stirred emotionally by the War, and has written some poems about it. But he is hampered by the necessity of preserving his American neutrality. Now poetry is possible only when restraint is removed and the head can express what the heart feels. So this is not the greatest poetry. The best of the book is the second half, which was written before the War began. There a poem on the opening of the Panama Canal has stirred his patriotism to its depths. He begins:

Lord of the sundering land and deep,
For whom of old, to suage Thy wrath,
The floods stood upright as a heap
To shape Thy host a dry-shod path,

Lo, now, from tide to sundered tide
Thy hand, outstretched in glad release,
Hath torn the eternal hills aside
To blaze a liquid path for Peace.

Vachel Lindsay.

Many of the poems in *The Congo, and other Poems*, by Vachel Lindsay (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net), have been written for reading in public, and minute directions are given in the margin for the proper way to read them. The first of them describe the customs of the Negro, each poem ending with the refrain:

Then I saw the Congo, creeping through the black,
Cutting through the jungle with a golden track—

whence the title of the volume. We shall quote a very short independent poem:

THE SUN SAYS HIS PRAYERS.

'The sun says his prayers,' said the fairy,
Or else he would wither and die.
'The sun says his prayers,' said the fairy,
'For strength to climb up through the sky.

He leans on invisible angels,
And Faith is his prop and his rod;
The sky is his crystal cathedral.
And dawn is his altar to God.'

Richard le Gallienne.

The new book of poems by Mr. le Gallienne opens with the popular one on *The Silk-Hat Soldier* which gives it its title (John Lane; 1s. net). 'British colonists,' said the *New York Times*, 'British colonists resident in London volunteer, and not even silk hats are doffed before training begins.' On which Mr. le Gallienne wrote. This is one verse:

I've seen King Harry's helmet in the Abbey hanging high—
The one he wore
At Agincourt;
But braver to my eye
That city toff
Too keen to doff
His stove-pipe—bless him—why?
For he loves England well enough for England to die.

But the general high quality of the poems will be better understood if we read the poem on a 'Soldier going to the War':

Soldier going to the war—
Will you take my heart with you,
So that I may share a little
In the famous things you do?

Soldier going to the war—
If in battle you must fall,
Will you, among all the faces,
See my face the last of all?

Soldier coming from the war—
Who shall bind your sunburnt brow
With the laurel of the hero,
Soldier, soldier—vow for vow!

Soldier coming from the war—
When the street is one wide sea,
Flags and streaming eyes and glory—
Soldier, will you look for me?

T. Whyte Paterson.

Few things are more difficult than the exposition of a proverb. They who have preached on texts in the Book of Proverbs know. When a truth has been once expressed in its most condensed and epigrammatic form, who can open it out again into the separate experiences which brought it to the birth without weariness of spirit? How much more difficult must it be to turn a proverb into a poem. And yet that is what Mr. T. Whyte Paterson has done successfully in his *Auld Saws in New Scots Sangs* (Gardner; 2s. 6d. net). There is not a weak or a wearisome poem in the book. And the Scots tongue is never at fault. The following example is one of the shortest, not one of the very best. The proverb is 'Pit a stoot hairt to a stey brae.'

Pit the hairt that's stoot
To the brae that's stey;
Gie the ferlies dowf a shouther yont,
An' gang on yer wey.

Set a sturdie fit
To the dreichest mile;
Lay a raxin leg to speel the tap
In the bauldest style.

Keep yer smeddum up,
An' yer courage dour;
An' haud on the track, tho' teuch an' sair,
Amang stanes an' stoor.

For ayont the knowe
Lies the brawest day,
To the ane that pits the stootest hairt
To the steyest brae.

Robert Hugh Benson.

Messrs. Burns & Oates are the publishers of *Poems*, by the late Mgr. R. H. Benson. They are introduced to their readers by Mr. Wilfrid Meynell in a short, all too short, biography, and there is an epilogue by Canon Sharrock of Salford Cathedral, describing Mr. Benson's last hours on earth. This is one of the poems:

AFTER A RETREAT.

What hast thou learnt to-day?
Hast thou sounded awful mysteries,
Hast pierced the veilèd skies,
Climbed to the feet of God,
Trodden where saints have trod,
Fathomed the heights above?
Nay,
This only have I learnt, that God is Love.

What hast thou heard to-day?
Hast heard the Angel-trumpets cry,
And rippling harps reply;
Heard from the Throne of flame
Whence God incarnate came
Some thund'rous message roll?
Nay,
This have I heard, His voice within my soul.

What hast thou felt to-day?
The pinions of the Angel-guide
That standeth at thy side
In rapturous ardours beat,
Glowing, from head to feet,
In ecstasy divine?
Nay,
This only have I felt, Christ's hand in mine.

John Bonus.

There is nothing more poetical or finer in conception in Dr. John Bonus's *Thoughts in Verse* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net) than the first poem. This is the first half of it:—

Above my lawns at Felixstowe
His giant arms the cedar flings;
And circling doves delight to show
The gleam and glitter of their wings.

And all the air it seems astir
With nature's merry rustic din,
The bees' deep hum, the chafer's whirr,
And all the beetles' kith and kin.

And scented lilies lift anear
To merry bees and butterflies,
Their chalices of nectar clear
That in their fragrant bosom lies.

And oft the comet swallow darts
Athwart the orbit of the dove;
And every bush hides little hearts
That beat for joy, that beat for love.

At the end of the book a short appreciation tells us something of the poet's personality. His degree of D.Ph. et Litt. he obtained at Louvain after missing it at Oxford. He acted as assistant and demonstrator to St. George Mivart. A medical man, he was also a vegetarian and anti-vivisectionist.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Thomas Shaw, South Shields.

Illustrations for the Great Text for April must be received by the 20th of February. The text is Ac 6^{28}.

The Great Text for May is Ph 2^{5-8}—'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of Lithgow's *The Parabolic Gospel*, and Coats's *The Christian Life*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for June is Ph 2^{9-11}—'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is some time since we have heard much about the Code of Hammurabi. What is the reason? It cannot be because the comparison between it and the Laws of Moses brought out the originality of the latter, for then we should have been thankfully told so by the believers in a supernatural revelation. Nor can it be because the Laws of Moses were proved to be derived from the Code of Hammurabi, for then the opponents of a supernatural revelation would certainly have published the fact abroad. We have heard little about the Code simply because its study has been so difficult. It has raised several unexpected questions, and even initiated some keen controversies. And scarcely any point in the comparison between it and the Laws of Moses has been placed beyond dispute.

The Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A., Litt.D., Master of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, took *The Relations between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples* as the subject of his Schweich Lectures (Humphrey Milford; 3s. net). The Lectures were delivered in 1912. But in publishing them in the end of last year Dr. Johns wrote a Preface in which he tells us what are the points in dispute, what progress has been made towards settling them, and what his own opinion is. And Dr. Johns has a right to his opinion. He is the author of the first translation of Hammurabi's Code into English, a translation which is still the best for comparison with the Mosaic Laws; and he has not ceased to study the laws of the Babylonians in their relation to the Laws of Israel from that day until now.

The study of Hammurabi's Code has derived much of its popular interest from the controversies over the criticism of the Old Testament. But it has not been helped by coming into contact with these controversies. Accordingly Dr. Johns gets out of that atmosphere as soon as he can. He carries us back for a moment to the days when the Higher Criticism had not been heard of, when the Laws of Moses were adopted by most Christian nations as a direct revelation from God, and accepted by our own King Alfred as the basis of the law of England. He refers to the birth of the Comparative Method, and its rapid rise into favour as a trustworthy weapon of research into the history of human institutions, with the result that the Laws of Moses were compared with the Roman Laws of the XII. Tables, with the Indian Laws of Manu, and with the Greek Code of Gortyna.

But the Comparative Method did not yield all the results that were expected of it. If it settled some controversies, it opened up others. And Jhering, the great authority on Roman Law, was

wondering whether for the elucidation of some of the puzzles in the Code of the XII. Tables, it would not be necessary to go back to the Babylonian Laws, of which very little was then known, when the great system of legislation called the Code of Hammurabi was discovered—a code which was soon found to be not only the oldest code in existence, the most complete, and the best attested, but even the most highly developed, with the exception of those that are quite modern.

It was inevitable that the keenest interest should be taken by scholars in the discovery. It was just as inevitable that it should become the subject of popular debate. For it was at once suggested, and somewhat triumphantly, that the Code of Hammurabi, being at least five hundred years older than the Laws of Moses, was the origin and inspiration of these Laws. And to this day that is the chief interest in the Code. No student can ignore it. Nearly all the writing on the Code in every country is the outcome of it. Dr. JOHNS passes as soon as he can out of the region of controversy regarding the dates and documents of the Old Testament, but his book, from beginning to end, is a comparison between the Code of Hammurabi and the Mosaic Law.

Now there are two types of law in the ancient world. The one may be called 'nomadic,' the other 'agricultural.' That is to say, the one type regulates the affairs of a tribe or people that is still in the wandering or pastoral stage of civilization. The other controls the conduct of a nation that has settled down to an agricultural or commercial life. Both types are seen in the Code of Hammurabi, and both are found in the Law of Moses.

In the Code of Hammurabi there are traces of nomadic law or custom. For the dynasty to which Hammurabi himself belonged had entered Babylonia as conquerors, probably out of the nomadic state. They were Semites. Conquering the Sumerians who were in possession of Babylonia, they settled among them and ruled over them. And no doubt, as they ruled over them, they imposed some of their laws upon them. But they did not set aside all the laws under which the Sumerians had been living. On the contrary, they would soon find that many of their own customs were ill adapted to their new mode of life, and they would be compelled to adopt to a large extent the laws of the settled subject race. The Code of Hammurabi dates from a period subsequent by a good many years to the entrance of his dynasty into Babylon. It therefore reflects both Semitic nomadic custom and Sumerian settled law.

Precisely similar is the situation in Palestine. The Israelites entered it under Joshua as nomads; they were a pastoral people. The Canaanites whom they found in the land were agriculturists; they had walled cities and they grew crops. The Israelites conquered the Canaanites and retained many of their own customs. Not so many, however, as we have been wont to think. For it is certain that they did not exterminate the Canaanites; and recent excavation in Palestine has shown that more traces of Canaanite than of Israelite life have remained to this day. When the Laws of Moses, as they are called, were codified, they retained traces of the early nomadic life of the Israelites themselves, and we cannot doubt (unless we are to insist upon their codification by Moses in the wilderness) that they contained also many enactments which were adopted from the settled and conquered Canaanites.

This, then, is the first result at which Dr. JOHNS arrives. Both the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi and the Israelite Code of Moses are compromises between two types of law.

And the first result is the last result. Dr. JOHNS is fairly sure of that result. He is not sure as yet of anything else. It is clear that when the further question is asked, Were the Mosaic Laws influ-

enced by the Laws of Hammurabi? there are at least four possibilities. The nomad Israelites may have come into contact with the nomad Babylonians. That is likely enough, for both were Semites, and in the far distances of history they no doubt were one in habitation as in race. Again, the nomad Israelites may have been in touch with the settled Sumerians, or rather with the Babylonians after the Sumerians were conquered by the dynasty of Hammurabi. That also is likely, for the Tell-el-Amarna tablets reveal a far-spreading influence on the part of Babylonia before the time when the Israelites entered Canaan. In the third place, the settled Canaanites may have had legal dealings with either the nomad Babylonians or the settled Sumerians, or both. And this also is probable enough, if it may not be called certain. For the same tablets tell us that the language of Babylonia was the medium of intercourse even between Palestine and Egypt. Last of all, the Israelites after they were settled in Palestine, and before their laws had assumed the form in which they have come down to us, had occasional intercourse with Babylonia.

But all this does not prove the dependence of the Mosaic Law on the Code of Hammurabi. It is sufficient, perhaps, to prove connexion between the two codes—if that much were in need of proof. It is not sufficient to say that the one code is derived from the other. Dr. JOHNS does not believe that the one is derived from the other. He believes rather that however they came in contact, and at whatever time or times, each of the codes must have developed along its own lines, and for the most part independently of the other.

Does the connexion which is probably to be asserted between them account for any of the similarities which they exhibit? These similarities are undoubtedly many and arresting. But 'some very remarkable similarities have been shown by Professor D. H. MÜLLER to exist between the Code of Hammurabi and the Twelve Tables of the Roman Law.' Professor COHN, of Zürich, has even pointed out strong likenesses between Hammurabi's Code and the laws of the West Goths. These resemblances are not likely, to say the least, to be due to borrowing or a common parentage. More probably they are the result of common human experience expressing itself in legislation.

On the other hand, there are similarities between the Babylonian and the Hebrew Codes that seem as if they must be due to the direct influence of the one on the other. Hammurabi twice orders death by burning. The Law of Moses also inflicts it twice. This might be a mere coincidence if it were an easy matter. But death by burning is a terrible punishment. It was felt by the later Jewish lawyers to be so terrible that they contrived a legal fiction to do away with its literal infliction even on the scandalous criminals for whom it was intended.

And when we consider the crimes for which this horrible punishment was inflicted we see that the correspondence is yet closer. In the one case in Hammurabi's Laws it is incest: it is incest in the Mosaic Law also (Lev 20^{14}). The other case seems to differ in the two codes. In the Babylonian Code the person that is to be put to death by burning is a votary or vestal virgin who has left her cloister to open a wineshop, or to frequent it for strong drink; in the Hebrew Code (Lev 21^{9}) it is the unchaste daughter of a priest.

But the difference is not so great as it seems to be. For in the first place the 'priest's daughter' is evidently more than the daughter of a priest. She is herself a priestess, else why are the other women of the priest's family exempted? In short, she too is what the Babylonian Code calls a votary or vestal virgin. In the second place, in Israel as in Babylonia the keeping of a tavern was closely associated with unchastity. Rahab, the tavern-keeper of the Book of Joshua, was also a harlot. And it is a striking fact that Josephus explains the

crime of the priest's daughter, not as unchastity, but as 'opening a tavern.'

Such likenesses, and there are not a few of them, refuse to resolve themselves into coincidence. They point either to a single original for the two codes, or to the borrowing of one from the other. And if borrowing is the explanation, there can be no doubt which was the borrower and which the lender.

It is often plausible, and it is sometimes true, to say that the Revised Version has missed the rhythm of the English language; it is rarely possible to say that it has missed the meaning of the Hebrew or the Greek. There is one case, however. And it is the more surprising in that it is a clear case of insufficient scholarship. The Revisers believed that the word which ends a famous verse in the Epistle of James is active in meaning; scholars are now unanimous in holding that it is passive.

The verse is this: 'The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.' In the Revised Version the translation is a surprise of difference: 'The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working.' The first difference is in the change of 'prayer' into 'supplication.' It is a needless change. The Revisers would not have made it if they had not been under a mild bondage to their rule of using the same English word for the same Greek word. Here the Greek word is different from the ordinary word for 'prayer,' and the Revisers simply tell us so.

The rest of the change, great as it is, is all due to a single word in the Greek. It is the word which ends the sentence, the word *energoumenê* (πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη). The Authorized translators render this word by two adjectives, 'effectual fervent'; the Revisers by a phrase, 'in its working.'

Now if the Authorized translators had left out the adjective 'effectual,' which creates an awkward tautology with 'availeth,' they would not have been far off the meaning. The Revisers have missed it altogether. They have produced an amazingly feeble statement. How could they allow themselves to think that the Apostle of the style that is terse to obscurity would have been guilty of such a tailing away? Moreover, they have probably made the Apostle say something quite other than he did say. For he did not say that every prayer of a righteous man is of much avail; he said the *fervent* prayer of a righteous man. And finally they have been guilty of a slip in scholarship, as has already been charged against them. In one respect only have they made an improvement on the Authorized translation. They have placed at the end of the sentence their translation of that word which James himself had placed at the end.

If we wished to translate the Greek words literally and in their order, we could not do better than turn to the rendering of Dr. Rendel Harris and adopt it. His rendering is: 'The prayer of a righteous man is of great force [when] energized.' Manifestly the whole virtue of the statement lies in the last word. That is why it is the last word. What does it mean? Dean Armitage Robinson thinks it means 'set in operation' by Divine agency. Dr. Rendel Harris remembers that 'real prayer is connected in a most intimate manner with the influences of the Holy Spirit,' and suggests, though with a 'perhaps,' that that is what is meant by 'energized.' But the meaning is not so obvious or so ordinary as these great expositors would have us think. And it is very much more profitable.

St. James speaks of the prayer of a righteous man. Has he any particular righteous man in his mind? Certainly. His great example of the righteous man who prayed and prevailed is Elijah. In the very next verse he says, 'Elijah was a man of like passions with us, and he prayed fervently that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth for three years and six months. And he prayed

again; and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.' Well, what was the characteristic of the prayer of Elijah? Its fervency. 'He prayed fervently,' says the Apostle. He used that peculiar Hebrew idiom 'praying he prayed,' so familiar to us in the Old Testament in spite of its frequent disguise in our English versions.

We have only to turn to our word with this in our mind. 'The prayer of a righteous man is of great force [when] energized'—not merely when energized by the Holy Spirit as every effectual prayer must be; its force comes from the energy that the man himself throws into it. 'The prayer of a righteous man is of great influence when he throws his whole energy into it.' The Apostle has in his mind, and that right vividly, the scene on Mount Carmel after the overthrow of the priests of Baal. 'And Elijah went up to the top of Carmel; and he bowed himself down upon the earth, and put his face between his knees. And he said to his servant, Go up now, look toward the sea. And he went up, and looked, and said, There is nothing. And he said, Go again seven times. And it came to pass at the seventh time, that he said, Behold, there ariseth a cloud out of the sea, as small as a man's hand. And he said, Go up, say unto Ahab, Make ready thy chariot, and get thee down, that the rain stop thee not.'

In Churches in which there is no Liturgy in use there has come a change in the emphasis of prayer within recent years. The emphasis has passed from Confession to Intercession. It is within the memory of many that the first prayer in public worship was called the Long Prayer, and consisted mainly of acts of confession. That prayer is now shortened. It is often shorter than the prayer that follows it, which is known as the Intercessory Prayer. It is impossible to miss the fact of the change. What is the cause of it?

It has two causes. One cause is the discovery of Intercession. With all the ills that this great war has brought us, it has brought us one good thing—a widespread recognition of the value of Intercession. But the value of Intercession is not a discovery of the war. The Christian conscience has been slowly awakening to the amazing absurdity of prayer to God that begins and ends with self. Slowly it has been awakening to the existence of a world in need, a world to which the arm of only one in a million of us can reach, but which can be gathered into our interests and brought under the influence of our intercessions.

The other cause is the demand for absolute sincerity. Undoubtedly the feeling has been growing that the proper place for Confession of sin is the secret chamber. There is still room for Confession in public. We may still confess our sins as a Church, as a Community, as a Country. But such confession must be general. When the leader in prayer endeavours to confess the sins of the individual sinners before him, it is inevitable that they should feel that, while he is able to recall many an object for Intercession which they had forgotten, he cannot bring to remembrance one in a hundred of the sins of which they have been guilty. And the leader in prayer, knowing this, has felt that it is not possible to confess particular sins and be sincere. For the particular sins he has most acquaintance with are the sins of his own heart and life, and the public worship of God is not the occasion for confessing them.

This, then, we have attained to. We know that the first demand upon us is that our prayer should be sincere. What we have not yet learned, but must now strive to learn, and to practise, is that it must also be energetic. If intercessory prayer is to prevail, if it is to have much influence, we must energize it, we must throw into it the energy of our whole personality.

But before we throw our whole personality into prayer we are arrested with the question of the value of intercession. For if there are difficulties surrounding prayer of every form, the

crowning difficulty is to believe in the value of intercessory prayer. We know that 'he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him,' which is as much as to say, 'If you believe in God, you must also believe in prayer.' But how can *another* be rewarded?

We cannot tell. We can only see that it is so. When the storm came down on the Lake of Galilee, and the boat in which Jesus and His disciples were, tossed by the waves, was in danger of swamping, the disciples prayed, and Jesus heard them. He rose and rebuked the wind, and said to the sea, 'Peace, be still,' and there was a great calm. Is that the whole story? In St. Mark's Gospel there is a sentence which claims our attention. Says St. Mark, 'And there were also with him other little ships.' Why does he tell us that? It is hard to say. But we are glad he tells us. For at once we think of those other little ships having the benefit of the calm. They had felt the storm and were not astonished. For a sudden storm on that lake is very common. But never before had they experienced so sudden and so complete an end to it. They had the benefit of the calm; they were the better for the disciples' prayer, and they did not even know that any one had prayed for them.

We must believe in Intercession as we believe in every other form of prayer. But it must be energized prayer. We must throw our whole personality into it.

We must throw our mind into it. For we must see to it that we are praying for the right things, and that we are praying to the right God.

Are we praying for the right things? St. James says, 'We know not what to pray for as we ought.' As we ought, he says. Suppose we are praying for missions. Do we know *what* we are praying for? Success, we say. What is success? Success in what? Do we know what missions are for? Do we know with any clearness what the missionaries are doing? Do we know any mission or any missionary intimately? Without some real knowledge we cannot pray as we ought, because we do not know what to pray for.

But we must also pray to the right God. In the present war nothing perhaps has occurred to shake the faith of the believer in Christ—at any rate of the half-believer—more than the reported prayers of the German Emperor. What is wrong with them? No one who has put his mind into the matter will answer and say 'insincerity.' What is wrong with them is that they are offered to the wrong God. They are offered to a God who is not the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. They are offered to a German God. But the true God has no respect of persons or of nations.

Again, we must throw our feelings into our prayer. This is the most obvious evidence of energy in prayer. And we are too timid about it. Hezekiah, the great king, prayed so energetically that the tears ran down his face. So did Nehemiah, the aristocratic governor. So did Paul, the once proud Pharisee. We are more careful to hide our emotions. Are we as careful to have them?

Last of all, we must throw our will into our prayer. Now there is no way of throwing the will into prayer that is so mighty in making prayer a force as the way of answering our own prayer. This is not a way of escape from the difficulties of prayer. It is not another form of the lame conclusion that whatever else prayer does it does good to those who pray. This is one of God's ways of answering prayer.

There is nothing more certain than that God often gives us the opportunity of answering our own prayers. And surely there can be nothing more gracious. For in this way prayer does do good to the man who prays, and a very much

greater good than the comfortable feeling that it is a good thing to pray, which is all that some of us seem to think can be got with certainty out of it. Does it cost something to fulfil one's own prayers? That is where the good of it lies. One may say with scarcely a reserve that its good is just in proportion to its sacrifice.

There is no finer example of how we may have the gracious opportunity of answering our own prayers than that which occurs in the record of the early life of Dr. Hudson Taylor—*Hudson Taylor in Early Years*, page 133. It is a long story, but to abridge it would be to lose the flavour of its gentle sincerity. This is the story: 'After concluding my last service about ten o'clock that night, a poor man asked me to go and pray with his wife, saying that she was dying. I readily agreed, and on the way to his house asked him why he had not sent for the priest, as his accent told me he was an Irishman. He had done so, he said, but the priest refused to come without a payment of eighteen pence, which the man did not possess, as the family was starving. Immediately it occurred to my mind that all the money I had in the world was a solitary half-crown, and that it was in one coin; moreover, that while the basin of water-gruel I usually took for supper was awaiting me, and there was sufficient in the house for breakfast in the morning, I certainly had nothing for dinner on the coming day.

'Somehow or other there was at once a stoppage in the flow of joy in my heart. But instead of reproving myself I began to reprove the poor man, telling him that it was very wrong to have allowed things to get into such a state as he described, and that he ought to have applied to the relieving officer. His answer was that he had done so, and was told to come at eleven o'clock next morning, but that he feared his wife might not live through the night.

'"Ah," thought I, "if only I had two shillings and a sixpence instead of this half-crown, how gladly would I give these poor people a shilling!" But to part with the half-crown was far from my thoughts. I little dreamed that the truth of the matter simply was that I could trust God plus one and sixpence, but was not prepared to trust Him only, without any money at all in my pocket.

'My conductor led me into a court, down which I followed him with some degree of nervousness. I had found myself there before, and at my last visit had been roughly handled. My tracts had been torn to pieces, and such a warning given me not to come again that I felt more than a little concerned. Still, it was the path of duty, and I followed on. Up a miserable flight of stairs into a wretched room he led me; and oh, what a sight there presented itself! Four or five children stood about, their sunken cheeks and temples all telling unmistakably the story of slow starvation, and lying on a wretched pallet was a poor, exhausted mother, with a tiny infant thirty-six hours old moaning rather than crying at her side, for it too seemed spent and failing.

'"Ah," thought I, "if I had two shillings and a sixpence, instead of half a crown, how gladly should they have one and sixpence of it." But still a wretched unbelief prevented me from obeying the impulse to relieve their distress at the cost of all I possessed.

'It will scarcely seem strange that I was unable to say much to comfort these poor people. I needed comfort myself. I began to tell them, however, that they must not be cast down; that though their circumstances were very distressing there was a kind and loving Father in heaven. But something within me cried, "You hypocrite! telling these unconverted people about a kind and loving Father in heaven, and not prepared yourself to trust Him without half a crown."

'I was nearly choked. How gladly would I have compromised with conscience, if I had had a florin and a sixpence! I would have given the florin thankfully and kept the rest. But I was not yet prepared to trust in God alone, without the sixpence.

'To talk was impossible under these circumstances, yet strange to say I thought I should have no difficulty in praying. Prayer was a delightful

occupation in those days. Time thus spent never seemed wearisome, and I knew no lack of words. I seemed to think that all I should have to do would be to kneel down and pray, and that relief would come to them and to myself together.

'"You asked me to come and pray with your wife," I said to the man, "let us pray." And I knelt down.

'But no sooner had I opened my lips with "Our Father who art in heaven" than conscience said within, "Dare you mock God? Dare you kneel down and call Him Father with that half-crown in your pocket?"

'Such a time of conflict then came upon me as I have never experienced before or since. How I got through that form of prayer I know not, and whether the words uttered were connected or disconnected I cannot tell. But I arose from my knees in great distress of mind.

'The poor father turned to me and said, "You see what a terrible state we are in, sir. If you can help us, for God's sake do!"

'At that moment the word flashed into my mind, "Give to him that asketh of thee." And in the word of a King there is power.

'I put my hand into my pocket, and slowly drawing out the half-crown, gave it to the man, telling him that it might seem a small matter for me to relieve them, seeing that I was comparatively well off, but that in parting with that coin I was giving him my all; what I had been trying to tell them was indeed true—*God* really was a *Father* and might be trusted. The joy all came back in full floodtide to my heart. I could say anything and feel it then, and the hindrance to blessing was gone—gone, I trust, for ever.

'Not only was the poor woman's life saved; but my life, as I fully realized, had been saved too. It might have been a wreck—would have been, probably, as a Christian life—had not grace at that time conquered, and the striving of God's Spirit been obeyed.

'I well remember how that night, as I went home to my lodgings, my heart was as light as my pocket. The dark, deserted streets resounded with a hymn of praise that I could not restrain. When I took my basin of gruel before retiring, I would not have exchanged it for a prince's feast. I reminded the Lord as I knelt at my bedside of His own Word, "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord"; I asked Him not to let my loan be a long one, or I should have no dinner next day. And with peace within and peace without, I spent a happy, restful night.'

We have said that when God gives us the opportunity of answering our own intercession the benefit is ours. So Dr. HUDSON TAYLOR found. But the benefit is also His. For in that way is the gospel preached, in that way does the Kingdom of God make progress. What tells for God more than character? What makes us sure of the love of God more than our experience of the love of man?

Ye are always singing the good Lord's praise,
  And publishing all that His hand
Has wrought for you in the bygone days,
  And all that His heart has planned.

And verily all that ye say is true;
  For I gratefully confess
That whatever the Lord has done for you
  He has done for me no less.

But when I remember the weary ways
  Which my feeble feet have trod,
And the human love which all my days
  Has helped me along the road,
Then the love of man is my song of praise
  As well as the love of God.

And I hardly think that I would have seen
  The love of God so clear,
Unless the love of man had been
  So visible and near.

Fresh Light on the Book of Daniel.

By Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., London.

In The Expository Times for June last year (p. 420) I gave, under the heading 'Glimpses of Life in Erech,' an account of some new inscriptions from that ancient and renowned city, gleaned from some of the tablets of the collection belonging to Mr. W. Harding Smith. An examination of a further instalment of tablets in the same collection has revealed the existence of other documents of a semi-historical nature, the contents of which will probably rejoice the hearts of many who have found in the Book of Daniel a stumbling-block to their faith.

As will be remembered, the tablets from Erech in the collection in question are mainly contracts; and such, in fact, is the nature of the new texts which I now bring to the notice of scholars. This, naturally, is somewhat disappointing, for we should all like to come across further material of the nature of the Babylonian Chronicle, to which we have been mainly indebted for details of Nabonidus' reign hitherto. Our consolation, however, is that the new material belongs to a class which cannot mislead us—written for the day whose date they bear, their chronological indications, as well as the accompanying historical and other information, would seem to be absolutely unimpeachable.

The important tablets are two in number. The earlier measures $1\frac{11}{16}$ in. high by $2\frac{5}{32}$ in. long, and is inscribed with 21 lines of writing. The clay is apparently unbaked, and being soft, worms have tunnelled holes through it, and in one place near the lower edge of the obverse, the points of entry and exit are visible. As, however, the damaged portions can, in most cases, be restored, the full translation may be given as follows:—

'Iši-Amurrū, son of Nûrānu, has sworn by Bêl, Nebo, the Lady of Erech,[1] and Nanâ, the oath of Nabonidus, king of Babylon, and Belshazzar, the king's son, that, "on the 7th day of the month Adar of the 12th year of Nabonidus, king of Babylon, I will go to Erech, to the presence of Zērî, steward of Ê-anna, and the (priests?) of Ê-anna, and the business of cattle-raising for the Lady of Erech, which is mine (*ina pania*), I will perform in Ê-anna." If, on the 7th day of the month Adar, Iši-Amurrū does not perform (*lâ îtepšu*) the business of cattle-raising with the steward and the priests of Ê-anna, he will commit a sin against the king' (*ḫiṭi ša šarri išaddad*).

Here follow the names of three witnesses, and that of the scribe. The date reads:

'City Maḫrâ, additional month of Adar, day 22nd, year 12th, Nabonidus, king of Babylon.'

(From this text it would seem that the additional Adar came before, and not after, Adar proper—it was on the 7th of the real Adar that Iši-Amurrū was to perform his vow.)

The importance of this inscription is that it places Belshazzar practically on the same plane as Nabonidus, his father, five years before the latter's deposition, and the bearing of this will not be overlooked. Officially, Belshazzar had not been recognized as king, as this would have necessitated his father's abdication, but it seems clear that he was in some way associated with him on the throne, otherwise his name would hardly have been introduced into the oath with which the inscription begins. We now see that not only for the Hebrews, but also for the Babylonians, Belshazzar held a practically royal position. The conjecture as to Daniel's being made the third ruler in the kingdom because Nabonidus and Belshazzar were the first and second is thus confirmed, and the mention of Belshazzar's 3rd year in Dn 8[1] is explained.

We have yet to learn what was the exact position of Belshazzar in the kingdom of Babylonia, but though he was, in the earlier part of his father's reign, with the army in Akkad, he constantly went, it may be conjectured, to Babylon, and contracts exist showing that he acquired property there. One point is noteworthy, namely, that his secretary, Nabû-kain-âḫi,[2] borrowed 45 shekels of silver, which is described as having been 'tithe of Bêl, Nebo, Nergal, and the Lady of Erech.' This, however, was not borrowed directly, but from Nabû-ṣabit-qatê, Belshazzar's major-domo, and was apparently

[1] Ištar. 'The Lady of Erech and Nanâ' are also mentioned in the inscriptions translated in The Expository Times for June 1914, pp. 420–422.

[2] Or *Nabû-takîn-uṣur*.

repaid through Nabû-âḫê-iddina, a descendant of Egibi.[1] In this transaction between the members of Belshazzar's household, there is probably no indication that the invocation of Ištar of Erech in Mr. Harding Smith's tablet was due to special connexions with the temple of the goddess in that city. 'The Lady of Erech' referred to in the British Museum text implies rather her temple at Babylon, where were also temples to the other deities mentioned—Bêl (Merodach), Nebo, and Nergal.

Naturally the existence of inherited authority might be of use in settling the question of any royal title applied to Belshazzar, and in this matter it may be well to refer again to the contract in which a seemingly blundering copyist has applied to a certain Nabonidus (he who afterwards became king of Babylonia?) the title 'son of the king of the city,' replacing 'he who is over the city' in the more correct copy. Though this is of no great value for the title 'king of the Chaldeans,' which is given to Belshazzar in Daniel, his being in residence at Babylon at the time Nabonidus, his father, was captured, implies that he may have been governor of the city, and therefore possessed authority which would otherwise have belonged to the king. This the later tablet, which I shall now describe, shows to have been customary at this period, if not at other times.

Unlike the tablet associating Nabonidus and Belshazzar, the second text is in an excellent state of preservation—well written and carefully baked. There is, it is true, slight damage to the reverse, but this only affects the list of witnesses, leaving the text proper intact. Its height is $1\frac{7}{16}$ in., and its length $2\frac{3}{32}$ in.; colour greyish-red.

This inscription runs as follows:—

'At the end of the month Chisleu, 4th year of Cambyses, king of Babylon and the lands, Ardîa,[2] son of Nabû-banî-âḫi, descendant of Rêmût-Êa, the man who is over the date-offerings of Ištar of Erech, will take 5 talents of early fruit, and deliver them, in the palace of the king, which is situated above Ê-anna, to Nabû-âḫa-iddina, the king's captain (*sak šarri* or *rêš šarri*), lord of Ê-anna's contribution. If he does not bring (the amount), he will commit a sin against Gobryas, governor of Babylon (*ḫiṭu ša Gubarru, âwel piḫāti Bâbîli, inamdin*). Besides the balances which are against them, they shall give an amount of 100 *gidimu*.'

Here follow the names of three witnesses and the scribe. The date runs:

'Erech, month Marcheswan, day 9th, year 4th, Cambyses, king of Babylon, king of the lands.'

The above inscription will show the importance of the question, whether Belshazzar was governor of Babylon—'king of the city'—or not. It is to be noted that the dates were for the royal palace in Erech, but if they were not delivered, the wrong committed is not described as being against Cambyses, but Gobryas, and the importance of this point will not be overlooked. Noteworthy, also, is the fact that he was still governor of Babylon in the 4th year of Cambyses—thirteen years after he took the city for Cyrus—and his possessing authority at Erech implies that he occupied a position which would be best described by the words 'Babylonian viceroy.' Babylonia and Assyria, at this time, were simply provinces of the great Persian Empire. The reference to the 3rd year of Cyrus in Dn 10[1] implies, however, that 'Darius the Mede,' son of Ahasuerus (a certain Xerxes), may not have been governor of Babylon and viceroy all the time. The age attributed to Darius the Mede in Daniel, 62 years, would make Gobryas (whom we must identify with him) to have been 75 at the time this tablet was written. Tiele's objection, that Cyrus would not have given power in Babylonia to a Mede, says nothing against the identification, as Gobryas, in the Babylonian Chronicle, is distinctly stated to have been governor of Gutium[m], a part of ancient Media. According to Xenophon, Gobryas possessed all the fidelity with which Orientals are often credited, for though he had no small hatred for Belshazzar, he remained faithful to Nabonidus to the end. He seems, however, to have regarded Belshazzar as the murderer of his son, hence the conflict in or near the royal palace at Babylon, and the death of this last representative of Babylonia's royal house.

How far Xenophon's account (*Cyropedia*, iv. 6) is correct, we do not know, but it is exceedingly interesting. That Gobryas should describe himself as an Assyrian (= Babylonian) seems most improbable, not only on account of the statement in

[1] Further details are given—*i.e.* the money was borrowed to purchase Nabû-ikribi-šime, a slave, and the transaction took place in the presence of the borrower's wife, Didîtu[m]. One of the witnesses was 'Arṣa'u, son of Kudma-âbi, slave of Belshazzar, the son of the king.' The date is: 'Sebat, day 9th, year 7th, Nabonidus, king of Babylon.'

[2] See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1914, p. 422, col. 1.

the Babylonian Chronicle, but also on account of his name and its varying forms.[1] Perhaps, however, he regarded himself as an Assyrian (= Babylonian) because he was a vassal of Nabonidus, in which case the expression would simply mean that he was a Babylonian subject.

[1] *Gubaru*, *Gubarru*, and *Ugbaru*, which, it might be argued, show that the pronunciation was *G'bāru*. The Greek Gobryas, on the other hand, implies a form like *Gubru*.

But the important point in this second inscription is the statement that Gubarru (Gobryas) was governor of Babylon, and that he was the person sinned against if Ardîa failed to deliver the 5 talents of dates required for the royal palace at Erech. As the official replacing the king, he evidently had royal power, and this tablet, like that mentioning Belshazzar, adds one more to the arguments that the Book of Daniel may not be so incorrect, historically, as it is commonly held to be.

National Hate.

By the Rev. John Pinkerton, B.D., Edinburgh.

'For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen: as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee: thy reward shall return upon thine own head.

'And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'—Ob 15. 21.

'Love your enemies.'—Mt 5^{44}.

We have heard much recently of a Hymn of Hate. That production has been received by some as if nothing similar to it had ever been made before. However true that impression may be in one respect, in another it is not well founded. This is not the first century in which nations have regarded each other with hatred. Two thousand five hundred years ago there were two peoples who hated each other with an extreme and lasting hate, and some writings, in which that hate was expressed, have found a place in the world's literature. These two peoples were the Hebrews and the Edomites. Their lands bordered each other in southern Palestine, and between them an intermittent warfare was waged for centuries. The hatred of the Hebrews against the Edomites found expression in many a hymn and prophecy, some of which are now preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures, *e.g.* the prophecy of Obadiah. There were doubtless many such of Edomite origin, but Time has robbed us of them all.

The hatred between these two peoples was remarkable in view of their many common interests. Racially they were closely related to each other. Obadiah and others speak of the relationship as that of brothers. 'Look not thou on the day of thy brother,' says Obadiah; and Amos accuses Edom of having pursued his brother with the sword. This intimate connexion is also witnessed to by the story that Jacob and Esau, the ancestors from whom these two peoples were descended, were twins. The languages they spoke belonged to the same stock, and, so far as we know, differed little from each other. Recent investigation has shown that certain of their religious practices were identical. Their position as buffer-states between two great empires—Egypt on the west, and Assyria or Babylonia on the east—strongly suggested that instead of wasting their powers in mutual strife they should unite their forces for mutual protection. But no! their animosity only increased with the passing centuries, so much so that the harm of the one was the joy of the other. It was with tumultuous gladness, Obadiah tells us, that the Edomites greeted the conquest of Judæa by the Babylonians in 586. To show how Israel reciprocated this hate, it need only be said that never do we find such hard things said about Babylon for all the sufferings it imposed on the Hebrews, as we find said about Edom.

What gave rise to this 'perpetual hatred,' as Ezekiel calls it, is unknown to us. It is certain that the Edomites were in many ways a favoured people. Their land though wild and mountainous contained many fertile valleys, and their position on one of the great trade-routes of the East—the route between Arabia and Asia Minor—enabled them to accumulate wealth as 'middlemen.' This may at times have excited the jealousy and cupidity of the Hebrews.

But the 'perpetual hatred' was probably due to

a deeper cause. The Edomites, as a people, seem to have been concerned mainly about what they should eat, and what they should drink, and wherewithal should they be clothed. In the character of the patriarch Esau we have the typical Edomite—a man taking no thought of the future, making light of birthrights and inherited powers, when material pleasures were at stake. They had no use for a people like the Hebrews, who felt they had a destiny, and were endeavouring to have that destiny realized. Edom wanted to make Israel subservient to its plans for money-making. Israel resented the interference of Edom, and the feud thus begun deepened to a hatred almost unparalleled in the history of man. The wrong done by Edom to Israel was further aggravated by the fact that the people who might have been expected to give sympathy and support gave nothing but antipathy and contempt. Israel asked for bread, and received a stone.

History often repeats itself, and to-day the world again sees the spectacle of two kindred nations hating each other with a cordial hatred. Of the fact that at least a large part of the German people hates this nation, there is incontestable proof. As to ourselves there is much ground for believing that the exasperation felt by this people at the reckless way in which Germany plunged Europe into war is deepening into a more intense and fierce passion. Yet Britons and Germans are descended from a common Teutonic stock. The two languages are not widely different from each other. Commercially and industrially they have been closely connected. In view, therefore, of their many common interests, there is ground for wonder at the feelings of hate which exist between the two peoples. The situation which confronts us now bears so many resemblances to that which existed between Israel and Edom, that a consideration of their relationship cannot but be of advantage.

I. *The nation whose greatest inspiration is a hatred, is doomed.*

History has two outstanding facts to record about the Edomites: (1) they were great haters; (2) they have perished.

I think that we may with assurance believe these two facts to be related to each other somewhat as cause and effect.

Of the manifestations of the human spirit, hatred is one of the most evil. It is like a noxious weed of rank growth, which getting root in a good garden gradually overruns it and reduces it to waste. Hatred warps the judgment and spoils the nature. It narrows the outlook—any one who knows a man who has a great grudge knows that that man's outlook is narrow. So absorbed is he in one interest, and that an evil one, that he ceases to develop his other spiritual capacities, and loses the power of appreciating other and higher interests. Hatred can thus result in the destruction of all the finer qualities of the spiritual nature of men. Just as an offence against the laws that govern the physical universe, *e.g.* the law of gravitation, means the injury of the offender, so an offence against those laws which control the spiritual universe involves the offender in spiritual injury. Hatred by reason of the way in which it makes the spiritual nature weak and imperfect constitutes an offence against the spiritual well-being of mankind, and with inevitable force the laws governing the spiritual universe work the destruction of the offender.

Edom hated Israel with a bitter hatred, but the main result of that hatred was the destruction of Edom. Edom had no love for the high things of which Israel at its best was in search, and it gradually lost the power of appreciating these things. The only inspiring motive which Edom had was hatred of all who sought high inspiration. The end was sure: no nation can live by hate, for hate blights. 'Where there is no vision, the people perish.' There was no vision in Edom, and Edom perished—a warning to all that the nation whose one inspiration is a great hatred, is doomed.

This hatred on the part of those whose tastes are material and earthy against those who can and do appreciate what is true and noble and spiritual, has been manifested by many races and classes other than the Edomites. Perhaps it has had no clearer illustration than the hatred felt by the world to Christ and His followers.

In St. John's Gospel this hatred is compared to the opposition between light and darkness. Christ says: 'And this is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light.' Again He says: 'The world hath hated me.' But such hatred is futile—it works its own

destruction. While Israel has lived, Edom has perished. The darkness of the pagan world is steadily vanishing before the light of the gospel. And it will be the same always. Even to-day as we know it to be in Germany, where a people is living in hatred of those who esteem what mankind acknowledges to be the highest and the best, there, we may be assured, the principle is operating, and such a people is working its own hurt.

Such a reading of the past is eloquent in its warning to us that by allowing our present feelings of resentment to deepen into hate, we would only be doing ourselves a great wrong.

II. *The saving power of a nation at a time when the hatred of other peoples is set against it, is a firm belief in the justice of the government of the universe.*

In many respects Edom was stronger than Israel. The land was practically impregnable, and the people possessed material resources which Israel never enjoyed. Yet it was Israel which prevailed in the long-drawn conflict. Against great odds it sustained itself by an indomitable belief that justice would be done to it, and that the cause which it championed would yet be acknowledged as right. This belief was expressed in passionate appeals to God to manifest His power in deliverance and to hasten the day of the Lord, or in a confident expectation that soon the might of God would prevail. Obadiah expresses this hope thus: 'And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'

There is much in human experience which seems to give the lie to the belief that there is an order in the universe, and that it is a just order. But deep down in the human breast there is the belief that, even because we have the knowledge of justice, there must be justice somewhere in this universe. Faith in justice and in the rationality of existence was strong in the Hebrew mind, and sustained it in spite of much trial. And a like faith has been found in every people or class or age which has been firmly persuaded of the truth which it professes, whatever that truth be. The early Christians were firmly convinced that the way of life in Jesus Christ was the highest life for man, and in the face of much persecution they held to that conviction. They believed that the world was founded on justice, and that all that was in accordance with the righteousness of God, revealed in Christ, must prevail because of this justice. Without this faith they would have failed. And their faith is being more fully justified each succeeding century.

But this belief in the Divine justice must be large enough to allow for a disciplining of one's own people or class. The people that thinks that God's judgments ought to fall only on other peoples, is probably just the very people by whom they are most required. The spiritual greatness of the Hebrew prophets is visible in nothing so much as in their recognition that the judicial processes of the Almighty would act adversely on their own people. They realized that there is no respect of persons with God, and that no people—no, not even Israel—had entirely succeeded in becoming 'the kingdom of God on earth.' The justice of God which saved Israel from Edom's hate also disciplined Israel.

We are at the present time oppressed with the hate of a great foe. His determination and resources might well induce feelings of disquiet. But strength and comfort can most surely be found in a steadfast faith in the justice of the world's government. We feel ourselves to be the custodians of certain ideals — ideals of honour, purity, and brotherhood, ideals of which our foe thinks lightly, and hates us for thinking highly. But as there is justice at the basis of the world's government, it must be that these ideals will prevail, that we shall be saved, and that the enemy's hate will result only in his shame.

Let us, however, also frankly recognize that that same justice may have to deal with us in discipline. Let us remember that we are fighting not only or mainly for the integrity of the British Empire—we are fighting for *purity and honour*. But before purity and honour can be established on the earth, the just God above who rules the destiny both of Britain and of Germany will have to discipline this people, so that all that is impure and dishonourable may be banished from our midst. As long as the 'white slave' haunts our streets, or the fraudulent financier our markets, our claim to be the defenders of purity and honour is in some measure weakened. We can be sure that the justice of God, which can and will protect us from the hate of a vengeful foe, will also chastise us for the sin that is in us.

III. *The justice of God is vindicated, not in the destruction, but in the salvation or perfecting of all who hate.*

The leaders of Hebrew thought believed that God would vindicate His justice in the extermination of those who hated His servants. Accordingly their almost constant prophecy was that the day of the Lord, the day of doom and death, was coming upon their foes. In entertaining such ideals they revealed one of the limitations under which they lived. 'Love thy neighbour, and hate thy enemy,' was the law they followed. They lived under a dispensation which had not outgrown the old law of retribution—'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.'

But since their time a new dispensation, associated with the life and work of Jesus, has been inaugurated, and its law is 'Love your enemies.' Jesus asserts that, not by hating one's enemy, but by loving one's enemy, is the justice of God to be vindicated. Reflexion shows that this wonderful command is right, this amazing statement true. What do we mean by the justice of God? God's justice is His sense of what is right and true and perfect, and His desire that all things shall be right and true and perfect in the world He has made. Now the man (or the nation) devoted to hate is, we have seen, imperfect, but his imperfection is not going to be remedied by his destruction, any more than an imperfection in his eye-sight is to be remedied by taking out his eye. The imperfection of his hate will be remedied only by the development of those capacities which are temporarily overcome by his hate. God does not execute His justice by destroying men, but by changing and transforming men. And to change a man or a world there is no power equal to the power of love—that love which is sometimes disciplinary, is always wise, and is never destructive.

Under this new dispensation we live. We are baptized in the name of Him who inaugurated it, and at His table we have pledged ourselves to His cause. If we would be worthy followers, we shall never go back to that Old Testament time and pray for a Day of the Lord to destroy them who hate us, but in all our dealings with our enemy, yea, in our fighting with him, we shall act in love, and not in hate. We shall strive earnestly for the victory, because our victory will be for the disciplining of our foe, but we shall always entertain towards him larger and nobler feelings than he now entertains towards us. We shall look forward to the time when the exercise of the more kindly offices of love shall be possible, and when by these that which is now imperfect shall be supplied and made perfect, when justice—God's justice, not man's justice—shall prevail on the earth, and 'the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'

Literature.

ZEUS.

THE most important contribution to the comparative study of Religion since the completion of Dr. Farnell's Cults of the Greek States has been made by Mr. A. B. Cook, Reader in Classical Archæology to the University of Cambridge. It is the first of two volumes entitled *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 45s. net).

'It would seem that the Greeks, starting from a sense of frank childish wonder, not unmixed with fear, at the sight of the animate sky, mounted by slow degrees of enlightenment to a recognition of the physical, intellectual, and moral supremacy of the sky-god. Dion Chrysostomos in a memorable sentence declared Zeus to be "the giver of all good things, the Father, the Saviour, the Keeper of mankind." On the lower levels and slopes of this splendid spiritual ascent the Greeks found themselves at one with the beliefs of many surrounding peoples, so that a fusion of the Hellenic Zeus with this or that barbaric counterpart often came about. On the higher ground of philosophy and poetry they joined hands with a later age and pressed on towards our own conceptions of Deity. I have therefore felt bound to take into account not only the numerous adaptations of Levantine syncretism but also sundry points of contact between Hellenism and Christianity.'

In these words Mr. Cook shows at once how vast is the subject he has undertaken to study, and

gives us a hint of how difficult it is. 'It is obvious,' he adds, 'that the limits of such an enquiry are to a certain extent arbitrary. I shall expect to be told by some that I have gone too far afield, by others that I have failed to note many side-lights from adjacent regions. Very possibly both criticisms are true.' Yes, both criticisms are true. Reading over again two or three of the articles which Professor Paton has contributed to the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS—the articles on the Ammonites, on Ashtart and on Atargatis, on Baal, on the Canaanites, on Dagan, and on Ishtar—we recall points of contact with the worship of Zeus which we should have been glad if Mr. Cook had given more attention to. Very likely Semitic scholars will one and all be on the side of those who say that he has 'failed to note certain side-lights from adjacent regions.' But, on the other hand, the general student of Religion, as distinct from the special student of one department, will be sure to think that this great book, which is meant for him, is more than sufficient to give him a working acquaintance with the cult of a single god.

But Mr. Cook not only anticipates criticism, he disarms it. With much frankness he tells us how hard he has found it to draw the limits of his subject and to discover the best method of pursuing it. The present reviewer read carefully and made elaborate notes of certain articles which Mr. Cook contributed to the *Classical Review* in 1903 and 1904; and he was surprised and a little disappointed to find that the method pursued in these articles had not been carried out in the volume now published. But the reason given is good. These articles were directly intended to support Sir J. G. Frazer's Arician hypothesis, so well known to the readers of the *Golden Bough*. Being satisfied that the evidence for that hypothesis was stronger than he at first anticipated, Mr. Cook pursued the theme into the Celtic, Germanic, and Letto-Slavonic areas. 'With that intent,' he says, 'I wrote another series of eight articles on "The European Sky-God" which appeared in *Folk-Lore* between the years 1904 and 1907. Of these articles the first three restated, with some modifications, the results obtained on Græco-Italic ground; and the remaining five were devoted to a survey of analogous phenomena among the Insular Celts. I had meant to go further along the same road. But at this point Dr. Farnell in the friendliest fashion put a spoke in my wheel by convincing me that the unity of an ancient god consisted less in his nature than in his name. Thereupon I decided to abandon my search for "The European Sky-God"; and I did so the more readily because I had felt with increasing pressure the difficulty of discussing customs and myths without a real knowledge of the languages in which they were recorded. After some hesitation I resolved to start afresh on narrower lines, restricting enquiry to the single case of Zeus and marking out my province as explained in the previous paragraph. Even so the subject has proved to be almost too wide. I incline to think that a full treatment of any of the greater Greek divinities, such a treatment as must ultimately be accorded to them all, properly demands the co-ordinated efforts of several workers.'

The last statement is unquestionably true. Nothing has been brought out more clearly by the recent study of Religion than the fact that when one man undertakes to cover alone any considerable subject his work is little worth. There are résumés of results, like those of Jevons and Marett, that are useful for the beginner. But it is doubtful if the beginner ought to begin with them. And these men are the first to declare that at every step they recognize the danger of giving a false impression, simply because they are ignorant of some cult or country into which the study runs; while nothing is more worthless and nothing more misleading than the attempts that used to be made by a single man to work a complete history of religion out of the books at his command. The unique value of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS arises from the fact that every religious idea or practice is treated separately by one who has made it his special study. This is not to say that Mr. Cook has failed. Very far from it. He has succeeded beyond all expectation; few are the students of religion who would have succeeded so well. But his success is due to the fact that he has had specialists beside him whom he could and did consult at every turn. His own knowledge is a surprise of breadth and accuracy, but it is certain that he would never have written this book if he had not been able to make it the result of 'the co-ordinated efforts of several workers.'

The importance of the study of Zeus lies not in the exaltation of his place among the gods, or in the extent to which his worship spread over the

world under one designation or another, but in the fact that in the cult of Zeus we see so clearly the movement of religious thought from the simplest natural elements to the most complex and forbidding conceptions. Zeus, whose name means 'the Bright One,' was originally conceived in zoïstic fashion as the bright sky itself—a conception that has left its mark on the language and literature of ancient Greece. The change from this zoïstic to the anthropomorphic Zeus was due to a 'naïve attempt to express heaven in terms of earth. The divine sky, as supreme weather-maker, was represented under the guise of an ordinary human magician or weather-ruling king. This transition, which had been accomplished well before the end of the second millennium B.C., meant that Zeus was no longer worshipped as the sky but as the sky-god.' The next step is to the mountain-top. As god of the bright or burning sky, Zeus dwelt in *aithér*, the most exalted portion of the celestial vault. And, since high mountains were supposed to rise above the lower zone of *aér* and to penetrate the upper zone of *aithér*, mountain-tops were regarded as in a peculiar sense the abode of Zeus. So the Greek, like the Jew, could sing, 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills.' But again, to the mind of the Greek, sun, moon, and stars were made of the same fiery stuff as the *aithér* itself. Zeus, therefore, must needs stand in relations of peculiar intimacy towards these special exhibitions of his own brightness. In short, Zeus was brought into close connexion with any and every celestial luminary. But, though this is undoubtedly the case, it must be steadily borne in mind that genuine Hellenic religion never identified Zeus with sun or moon or star. If an inscription records the cult of Zeus Helios, if a coin represents Zeus with the moon on his head, if a myth tells us Zeus transforming himself into a star, we may be reasonably sure that inscription, coin, and myth alike belong to the Hellenistic age, when—as Cicero puts it—a Greek border was woven on to the barbarian robe.

But we need not pursue the evolution further. Is it not written down in the book of *Zeus*? This volume deals only with Zeus as 'God of the Bright Sky.' And, 'I would warn my readers,' says Mr. Cook, 'that the story runs on from Volume I. to Volume II., and that the second half of it is, for the history of religion in general, the more important. Zeus god of the Bright Sky is also Zeus god of the Dark Sky; and it is in this capacity, as lord of the drenching rain-storm, that he fertilizes his consort the earth-goddess and becomes the Father of a divine Son, whose worship with its rites of regeneration and its promise of immortality taught that men might in mystic union be identified with their god, and thus in thousands of wistful hearts throughout the Hellenic world awakened longings that could be satisfied only by the coming of the very Christ.'

JONATHAN SWIFT.

With the issue of the fifth and sixth volumes, Dr. F. Elrington Ball has brought to a close his handsome edition of *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* (Bell; 10s. 6d. net each). Both he and his publishers deserve the thanks of every lover of Swift—and their tribe is on the increase—and of every student of English literature. No English author has ever had his correspondence more lovingly or more competently edited. Walpole's *Letters* are more voluminous, and there is a fine edition of them on our shelves. But even Walpole did not receive more thought, and he did not deserve more thought, than has been given to the perfecting of this edition of the letters of Dean Swift.

To crown his favours Dr. Ball has added to the sixth volume two Indexes, the work of Miss Constance Jacob, one of correspondents and one of topics, together running from page 250 to page 388, and without a superfluous entry. Fitzgerald wrote a *Dictionary of Madame de Sévigné* for the sole purpose of getting out of the tangle of names which occur in her letters. There are more names in Swift than in Madame de Sévigné, and they are not easy to disentangle; but there will never need to be published a Dictionary of Jonathan Swift, for these Indexes have already done all that is necessary. They form a complete and most convenient *Who's Who* to Swift's Correspondence.

The publishers, as we have said, deserve our thanks as well as the editor. Everything connected with the issue of the books, including the illustrations, is of the best and most artistic workmanship. Let us see to it that they reap some reward in a great circulation of so great a book.

ANNALS OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

A handsome book, not unworthy of the greatness of its subject, is *Annals of the Free Church of Scotland, 1843–1900*, edited by the Rev. William Ewing, D.D. (T. & T. Clark; 2 vols., 21s. net). It is not the whole history of the Free Church of Scotland—which Dr. Ewing would say goes back far beyond 1843, though it had no adjective then, and continues even until now, though it has added another adjective. Nor is it a history at all, but what it is called—*Annals*. It contains the names of all the Ministers and Congregations of the Church, and the outward facts of their ministerial life up to the year of the Union. For example—to take one that happens to turn up by chance:

KEITH-FALCONER, HON. ION GRANT NEVILLE, M.A.

Born at Edinburgh, 1856. Son of the eighth Earl of Kintore. Studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, and Leipzig. Appointed Hebrew lecturer at Clare College, Cambridge, in 1883, Married the following year at Cannes, Gwendolen Bevan. In 1885 he offered himself to the Free Church, of which he was a communicant, as a missionary to the Mohammedans of South Africa, and by the General Assembly of the following year was recognised as a fully accredited missionary of the Free Church. Appointed, the same year, Lord Almoner Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. In November 1886 he arrived at Aden, and before the close of the year was living in a temporary residence in Sheikh Othman. In the beginning of 1887 he had repeated seizures of remittent fever. Died on 10th May 1887. 'Very visibly he gave to the cause and kingdom of our Lord Jesus all he had. His university distinction, his oriental learning, his position in society, his means, the bright morning of his married life, his physical vigour—for he had trained body as well as mind—he brought them all to the service' (R. R.).

Publications.—*A Plea for the Tower Hamlets Mission. Kalilah and Kimnah: otherwise known as The Fables of Bidpai.* Translated from the Syriac.

Posthumous.—*Memorials of the Hon. Ion Keith-Falconer, M.A.* By the Rev. Robert Sinker, D.D., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1888.

The second volume contains the record of the Congregation. And this time we must take as example an Edinburgh church:

ST. GEORGE'S.

Dr. Robert S. Candlish, minister of the parish of St. George's, had taken a prominent part in the Non-Intrusion controversy, and, along with many of his congregation, adhered to the Free Church in 1843. As a place of worship they rented for a time a brick building in Lothian Road. A new church, on a site nearly opposite the entrance to the West Kirk, was opened in 1845. This build- was bought up in 1866 by the Caledonian Railway Company, whose station covered the site. A new church was erected in Shandwick Place, and opened in 1869. The congregation has an honourable record for enterprise and liberality in the work of church extension in the western district of the city.

Membership.—1848, 918; 1900, 1231. *Ministers.*—1. Robert Smith Candlish, D.D., 1843–1873; 2. James Oswald Dykes, D.D., 1861–1865; 3. Alexander Whyte, D.D., LL.D., 1870– ; 4. Hugh Black, D.D., 1896– .

ROLLAND RAINY.

The *Life of Adam Rolland Rainy, M.P.*, has been written by his Wife (Maclehose; 6s. net). There is no great choice of incident to make the biography attractive to outsiders. Nor had Mr. Rainy reached so conspicuous a place in the world as to draw to the details of his life the curiosity of the vulgar. His wife has done nothing to attract the outsider or encourage common curiosity. Better far, she has given us the opportunity of knowing and forming friendship with a singularly winning personality, a man of upright, attractive life, a true lover of the Lord.

The only exciting event is the election of 1906, when Mr. Rainy (after one defeat and five years exemplary waiting) won the Kilmarnock Burghs for the Liberal party with a majority that took everybody's breath away. The story is well told, simply, truthfully, thankfully. As there are no untouched triumphs in this world, the one regret that his mother did not live to share it, is not hidden; it makes the picture complete.

Without doubt he was great, and would have been known, had God so willed it. He did

nothing small: he hated all mean things. His growth as a speaker is visible in the book. It was very remarkable. He took no advantage. He inquired into things with care. He saw clearly, and he uttered as clearly his convictions.

Take one amusing item out of one of the speeches. He detested pretence. He disliked the making of enquiries—when the facts were known already—just to delay and do nothing. So he said: 'We have heard of an enquiry. I wonder if you ever heard of the anxious enquirer. He was a gentleman who was always anxious to find out everything. One night, after a dinner, he was going home in evening-dress, and on passing a lamp-post he noticed on the crossbar of this lamp-post that there was a placard. He could not read it from the street, and so he made up his mind at all costs that he would prosecute an enquiry as to what was on that placard. He shinned up the lamp-post, lit a match, and read the inscription, "Wet paint".'

CHURCH DEDICATIONS.

Mr. James Murray Mackinlay, M.A., F.S.A., has completed his study of *Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland*. In an earlier volume he gave an account of Churches dedicated to Scriptural Saints. The new volume deals with those dedicated to Non-Scriptural Saints (Edinburgh: David Douglas; 12s. 6d. net).

The work is done both thoroughly and completely. The saints are separated out, so far as that is humanly possible, and sufficient is told of their lives, both historical and legendary, to give the reader an interest in them; the folklore attaching to their names, or to the churches dedicated to them, is never missed—in this department of Scottish folklore Mr. Mackinlay is a recognized authority—and even the architectural features of the buildings are not forgotten. Few are the studies which demand patience and judgment as does the study of hagiology. But these qualities Mr. Mackinlay has been gifted with, or has trained himself into, beyond most of his contemporaries. The first impression that the reading of this volume makes is the sanity of its author, and that impression is deeper at the end than at the beginning.

What a fascinating study that of dedications is in the hands of a master. Any subject may be fascinating when knowledge of it is enough to hold the mind. But this subject in Mr. Mackinlay's hands catches the interest at once.

When the editor of this journal was called to St. Cyrus, he received a letter from Professor Sayce. Professor Sayce thought he knew something of the Medes and Persians, but it was the first intimation to him that the king of the Persians had been made a saint. It is not the king of the Persians. Who *is* the saint? Let Mr. Mackinlay tell us:

'As we have seen, St. Christopher presented himself to the mediæval imagination as a giant. St. Cyric, the next Eastern saint to be referred to in connection with our Scottish dedications, was of a different type. He was a child only three years old, who was conveyed from Iconium to Tarsus in Cilicia by his widowed mother, St. Julitta, during the persecution of the Christians by the Emperor Diocletian. At Tarsus, St. Julitta was apprehended, and taken, along with her child, before Alexander, the pagan governor. She was tortured and then beheaded. Her child, following her example, called himself a Christian, and in consequence met his death by being violently thrown by Alexander down the marble steps of his judgment-seat.

'In some English dedications mother and child were commemorated together; but in Scotland the child-martyr appears to have been alone remembered. Bishop Forbes has suggested that Ceres in Fife is merely an altered form of the name of Cyric, and if so its church owed allegiance to him.

'The one undoubted dedication to the child-martyr was the church of St. Cyrus in Kincardineshire, formerly known as Ecclesgreig. It is believed to have been founded in the ninth century by King Girig, otherwise styled Grig, Girg, Greg, Gregour, and Ciric. "There is a curious notice in the Pictish Chronicle, that in his (Grig's) ninth year an eclipse of the sun took place 'die Cirici.' The day of St. Cyricus fell on the 16th of June, and there actually was a great eclipse of the sun on the 16th of June 885, which corresponds tolerably well with his ninth year. This seems to show some connection between his own name and that of the saint; and it is curious that a church in the Mearns, dedicated to St. Cyricus, is called in old charters, Ecclesgreig, or the Church of Greig." The most likely explanation is that the church of St. Cyrus was founded to commemorate

both the king and the saint. The original building probably stood in the old burying-ground near the sea, locally known as the Nether Kirkyard. We learn that on the 7th of the Ides of August 1242 "the church of Cyricus the martyr of Eglisgirg was dedicated by Bishop David de Bernham." This must have been the successor of King Girig's foundation.'

CANON WIDDICOMBE.

The Rev. John Widdicombe, after spending a long life of service for the Master, has written down his *Memories and Musings* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) before passing to his account. He served first in certain ritualistic London churches at the time when ritualists were 'Puseyites' and had to fight (often literally) for toleration. Then he went to South Africa and held the pastorate of several parishes in the veld, became Canon of Bloemfontein, and so came home to write his memories and musings.

Canon Widdicombe must be a very old man, but his memory of events which happened forty or fifty years ago is so good that he trusts it to the least detail, even to the length of long verbatim conversations. And there is no inconsistency to condemn his faith. With an old man's privilege he goes on without much care for system, but the course of his life is quite easily followed, and the incidents and anecdotes fall in quite properly. His attitude is that of a moderate High Churchman, who has no belief in Establishment. In South Africa, he says, 'there is no State Church. There is a fair field and no favour for every denomination of Christians, and surely that is all that Christianity needs. The Anglican Church, like other Christian bodies, is, as we have seen, entirely free from the trammels of State control, and I for one thank God that such is the case.'

Canon Widdicombe tells good stories and tells them well. He tells them with circumstance—the way to make a story either a hit or a miss. Perhaps this one will suffice:

'Among the workers in Bloemfontein was one—an elderly (I must not say old) maiden lady whose name was Grimes—a lady held in honour by all. She was a gentlewoman of independent means and highly accomplished, and had given her time, talents and money to the poor of the town. She had been ordained deaconess by the Bishop, and was in every way worthy of the office. She was a good pianist, and could make charming water-colour sketches of the scenery around, and last but not least she was the soul of humour; everyone who knew her considered her delightful.

'One Sunday evening in the midst of our repast she looked towards the Bishop and cried out in tearful tones, "My lord, I am compelled to appeal to you. I am being persecuted beyond endurance."

'I must explain that some of us at the table, myself among the number, suspected what was behind that tearful exclamation. There was a little man in the town well connected and still young, who was eccentric and almost half-witted. Indeed many people regarded him as insane, but he was not quite that. He was well meaning and quite harmless and in his poor way devout, and was a regular attendant at the cathedral. Now this simple-minded youth had unfortunately conceived a violent affection for the deaconess. In fact he was madly in love with her, although she was old enough to be his grandmother. He waylaid her whenever he could as she came out of church, and sent passionate letters to her, protesting his undying affection for her and urging her to consent to marry him. She tried in every way to avoid him, but often to no purpose. He became a terror to the dear old soul, and yet the whole thing was so ludicrous that she could not help laughing at the absurdity of it, and heartily joined in the laughter when her lady friends rallied her on the subject, since a matter of that kind could not long be hidden. I was one of those who had got to hear of it and was, of course, very sorry for the poor old lady, and would have gladly come to her rescue had it been possible, but nothing could be done. That Sunday evening matters culminated. The infatuated youth had bribed a chorister to deliver a letter to her, and the small boy had done so after evensong. Hence her appeal to the Bishop.

'His lordship heard her cry and answered, "What is the matter, Miss Grimes?"

'"Oh, my lord, I repeat I am being persecuted beyond endurance."

'"What is it, and how are you being persecuted?" asked the Bishop in amazement.

'Of course everyone at the table was listening.

'"Well," she said, "I hardly like to mention it, but mention it I must. Just now coming out of church this letter was put into my hands. I will

read it, and then you will see how greatly I am being persecuted." And she proceeded to read aloud the effusion which the susceptible swain had sent her. I cannot, of course, remember its exact wording or the whole of it, for it was lengthy, but I will give the pith of it, together with its concluding words, which are indelibly impressed upon my memory.

'"My Dearest Miss Grimes, my Angel,—I write these few lines to tell you once more how deeply and dearly I love you. You are ever in my thoughts. I think of you all day and dream of you all night. You know how dear you are to me, and yet you treat my affection with cold indifference and I am afraid contempt, for of late you have taken care to avoid me and have never given me the least chance of speaking to you. Hence I am compelled to write once more and implore you to have pity upon me and give me a favourable hearing. Surely the heart of so dear and loving a lady as yourself, so good to everyone, cannot be made of stone. Then why are you so hard to me?

'"Oh, *do* relent, and tell me that my love for you has conquered, and give me some faint hope that some day I may be able to call you mine.

'"But if you will not listen to my prayer: if you continue to remain unmoved and refuse to give me the least spark of hope, oh! what will become of me? I shall gradually *pine away—wasted by unrequited affection, until I am reduced to the dimensions of the enclosed morsel of soap.*"

'And she displayed to our gaze the small piece of that article enclosed in the letter.

'At the time the old lady had been reading this affecting epistle in her high-pitched, tremulous voice we had with the utmost difficulty restrained ourselves from laughter, but now our laughter burst forth into one great continuous roar, in which our dear old friend joined as heartily as any at the table. Even the grave and stately Bishop was overcome and had to stuff his handkerchief in his mouth to control himself. It was excruciatingly amusing!

'I am glad to add that the young man gradually overcame his preposterous infatuation and diverted his defective brains into a more legitimate channel.'

The rationalistic account of Apostolic Christianity has been restated by Mr. Alfred W. Martin, A.M., S.T.B., in a book entitled *The Dawn of Christianity* (Appleton; 5s. net). It is not a credible account even on the face of it. The results were bigger than these puny forces were fit to produce. But it is shattered on the rock of scholarship. Mr. Martin knows what happened at every step in the 'evolution' of Christianity, and how it happened. But when he has least hesitation he is most astray. The formation of the Canon of the New Testament he describes in a few magisterial sentences; scholars have had to write complete books about it and leave the half of the story unexplained.

But the author is honest. We see no evidence anywhere that he gives himself to the mere joy of thwarting the tradition of the Church. What he writes he writes in all sincerity as *his* account of the matter. And often it is impressive; always interesting.

Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids has contributed to 'The Quest Series' published by Messrs. Bell & Sons, a volume on *Buddhist Psychology* (2s. 6d. net). Now Mrs. Rhys Davids is a Buddhist scholar of great accomplishment, and like a true scholar she gives herself to the mastery of one department. That department is the Psychology of the Buddhists. Thus her book is to be looked upon, not as an elementary introduction to its subject—though it is clear enough to serve that purpose—but as the most authoritative work on it in English.

To Messrs. A. & C. Black's convenient and attractive series of books, 'The Social Workers Series,' edited by Mr. William Foss, a volume has been added on *Trade Unionism*, written by Mr. C. M. Lloyd (2s. 6d. net). It is now an immense subject with an enormous literature, and Mr. Lloyd has been extraordinarily successful in seizing the significance of it and making it ours, together with just the necessary detail. His book is sufficient for the student, besides being suitable for the accomplished and serious general reader. And it may be trusted. The author has not spared himself or his friends in the verification of fact; and though he has written with decision, he is not the victim of prejudice.

The Solitaries of the Sambuca, by Daniel Mauldsley (Burns & Oates; 5s. net), is a persuasive to

adopt the Catholic faith. It takes the form of a novel, but the story, though not without interest, is subordinate to the apology, and owes most of its interest to the psychological situation. The conversion of the hero—his conversion at once to God and the Roman Church—was due to a conviction of sin. There could be no better (can there be any other?) cause. But why to the Roman Church? Because 'it alone was now the only Religion which, with no uncertain voice, taught the doctrine of Eternal Punishment.'

Has philosophy ever been of any practical use? The question is raised by Mr. Henry Sturt, M.A., Private Tutor in the University of Oxford. His answer is, No. It has been of use, he says, as poetry has been of use. 'It has brought home to man the mystery and romance of his existence; it has led his mind up from low thoughts and cares into a higher and purer atmosphere. Its greatest importance has been with religion; if religion is useful, then philosophy has been useful. Popular religion is very largely a substitute for philosophy; and even in minds where the two things are kept most distinct, they must interact in no small measure. They have interacted most where they have been pursued most keenly. What would medieval theology have been without Aristotle? And what would medieval philosophy have been without the medieval Church?'

But that is not the 'use' that is meant? Is philosophy of any use in practical life? To that question Mr. Sturt answers with an unhesitating No. 'What statesman makes any appeal to political philosophy; what moral reformer makes appeal to ethics; what educator who professes to train the understanding makes appeal to logic?'

Hegel even said that Minerva's owl cannot begin its flight till the shades of evening have begun to fall.

But Mr. Sturt thinks that that owl has hooted too long. Philosophy *ought* to be useful. 'It is the duty of philosophy, I maintain, to establish theoretical principles on such matters as politics, moral conduct and education; and these principles should be valuable for the guidance of practical men.' And he has written a book on *The Principles of Understanding* to prove it (Cambridge: At the University Press; 5s. net). It is not a very large book, but in our judgment it is likely to open a new era in the teaching of philosophy. For Mr. Sturt not only uses the language of practical men—he has indeed a wonderful gift of straightforward speech—but he actually fulfils his promise.

The new volume of 'The Great Christian Theologies,' edited by Dr. Henry W. Clark and published by Messrs. Chapman & Hall, is *Albrecht Ritschl and his School* (7s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Robert Mackintosh, D.D., Professor of Ethics, Christian Sociology and Apologetics, in Lancashire Independent College, and Lecturer in the University of Manchester.

In an interesting and amusing preface, Professor Mackintosh tells us the story of his hunt for rare books and rarer pamphlets containing material for his study. He has manifestly left no stone unturned (we hope he has left all his friends' heads unturned) in his determination to know the subject before he wrote upon it. Quite unintentionally the preface gives us assurance that this scholar has a keen sense of the claims of authorship, and that whatever his interpretation of Ritschlianism may be, his knowledge of it will not be found at fault. Moreover, he has written here with a clearness of vision surpassing that of any other book of his.

Professor Mackintosh's attitude to Ritschl and his school is not far from that of Dr. Garvie. He has given much study to the *School*. What has been done by Ritschlians since Ritschl—that is his chief interest and his greatest contribution. And he takes the men not only singly but also together, bringing out their influence on one another clearly and often quite strikingly. Another useful feature of his book is the way in which he traces the history of the great Ritschlian watchwords such as 'Value-Judgment,' carrying the investigation back beyond Ritschl himself as well as down from Ritschl to the present day. And as he proceeds he never loses himself in the wood, but keeps in sight the great questions of life, and at every turn directs our attention to them.

The book is more than a success. It advances our knowledge of Ritschlianism.

Part II. has now been published of *Lessons from the Old Testament*, being Notes Critical and Expository of the Passages appointed for Sundays and Holy Days, by the Rev. A. S. Hill Scott, M.A., Vicar of St. Lawrence, Seal, and the Rev. H. T. Knight, M.A., Vicar of Shortlands, Kent (Oxford University Press; 3s. 6d. net). This

second part covers the Lessons from Trinity Sunday to All Saints.

By a coincidence we have two volumes this month dealing with Church dedications, Mr. Mackinlay's on the Scottish Churches, and *Dedications and Patron Saints of English Churches*, by Mr. Francis Bond, M.A., F.G.S. (Humphrey Milford; 7s. 6d. net).

Mr. Bond's volume has a wider range than Mr. Mackinlay's. It includes the Biblical Saints (which Mr. Mackinlay treated in an earlier volume) as well as the Ecclesiastical; it contains a discussion of the whole subject of Dedication; it enumerates the saints in England who have no Dedications. And all this is only the first part of the volume. The second part deals with Ecclesiastical Symbolism, a very different subject; while the third part has something to say about Ecclesiastical Vestments, and contains an alphabetical list of the Saints with their Emblems. But the most conspicuous difference between the two volumes is found in the fact that Mr. Bond's volume contains 252 illustrations.

To get all this into a single volume Mr. Bond has had to walk circumspectly. He has not given us much biography of the saints, and less folklore. His work is more in the form of a catalogue than a history. Yet he has succeeded in making his book quite readable. We shall turn to it for facts rather than for diversion; but when we take it up to verify a date or discover a name, we are pretty sure to be found with the book in our hand some time after, caught by the interest which every fact has gained from its setting. And then the names and the dates, many as they are, have been carefully verified and may be confidently relied upon as accurate—if accuracy is ever an idea to be associated with saints and their records.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published a new volume of sermons by Professor Driver. Its title, taken from one of the sermons (first published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES), is *The Ideals of the Prophets* (3s. 6d. net). The texts are all great texts, and the sermons are all great sermons. This is one of the wonders of Dr. Driver's work, that he had so complete a control of his learning as to be able to make it seem no learning at all. These sermons say the last word as exposition of their text, and in saying it reveal great principles of prophetic inspiration, yet any child in the congregation might say, 'I understood every word.' Is it possible to make the prophets edifying while adhering truthfully to their historical time and circumstances? Every one of these sermons answers Yes.

Messrs. Cornish Brothers of Birmingham, Publishers to the University, have issued very handsomely *Huxley Memorial Lectures to the University of Birmingham*, with an introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge, D.Sc., F.R.S. (5s. net). Nine Huxley Lectures have been delivered since their inauguration in 1904, but it has been found impossible to publish more than five of them. Yet these five make a goodly sized volume, and each one of them is a real contribution to knowledge. The first is an appreciation of Huxley as a man, by Sir Michael Foster. The second explains Huxley's attitude to Natural Selection, by Professor E. B. Poulton. The other three pass from Huxley and discuss some purely scientific problem —Rationalism and Science in Relation to Social Movements, by Professor Percy Gardner; Life and Consciousness, by Professor Henri Bergson; and Pleochroic Haloes, by Professor John Joly. The last lecture is usefully illustrated

---

Mr. A. S. Morton's story of *Galloway and the Covenanters* (Paisley: Gardner; 7s. 6d. net) is at once a history of a great religious movement and a contribution to the local annals of an interesting neighbourhood. Perhaps Mr. Morton is more concerned with the neighbourhood than the movement. When he plunges into history he reads well; but often he passes through the stony and somewhat shallow waters of the local annalist, offering us such stones as lists of names for the bread of the imagination. Once and again, however, even amongst the names, he is arrested by a name that appeals to his own and our imagination powerfully enough to lift us out of the shallows. Such a name is that of Samuel Rutherford.

It is a book for which Galloway must be grateful. It is a book which the future historian of the Covenant and of Scotland will find indispensable.

Under the title of '*Ich Dien*,' the Rev. M. Persse Maturin, M.A., has published some 'Elementary Studies in the Life of Service' (Griffiths). There are six sermons or studies—The Inspiration of

Service, Obstacles to Service, Strength for Service, The Majesty of Service, Leading Others to Service, and Endurance in Service.

To the 'Every Age Library,' Mr. Kelly has added an edition of Mrs. Gaskell's *Mary Barton*, of George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss*, and of Kingston's *Mark Seaworth*, together with a new edition of *The Citizen of To-morrow*, a volume of essays on Social subjects edited by the Rev. S. E. Keeble (1od. net each).

In 'The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures,' the Epistles to the *Ephesians and Colossians* have been done by the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J., and those to *Philemon and Philippians* by the Rev. Alban Goodier, S.J. (Longmans). No commentary, we should think, was ever published on the Pauline Epistles with fewer notes.

A book of prayers by the Rev. G. C. Binyon, M.A., originally published under the title of *Adveniat Regnum*, is now issued in a second edition by Messrs. Longmans under the title of *Prayers for the City of God* (2s. 6d. net). The volume contains Prayers for Personal Use; Prayers before, during, and after Communion; Intercessions for a Week; the Penitential Psalms; and other minor Prayers. The Prayers are chosen mostly from modern sources, such as Westcott, Elmslie, Kingsley, Adderley, Waggett. They are brief, varied, and to the point.

The Ven. Walter Stephen Moule, M.A., Principal of C.M.S. Training College, Ningpo, and Archdeacon in Chekiang, China, has published a large octavo volume under the title of *The Offerings made like unto the Son of God* (Longmans; 6s. net). The title is intended to cover an explanation, in the light of the Sacrifice of Christ, of all the great elements of the ancient Hebrew ritual. The book has been written for edification. Archdeacon Moule is a scholar, but he makes no account of scholarship. He is a preacher and teacher of the gospel; his whole heart is there. Accordingly he has deliberately ignored all that is known by the name of Higher Criticism. He has not answered it or any of it; he has ignored it. He takes the laws of Moses as they now stand and uses them for Christian instruction and growth in grace.

Has he any right to do this? His answer is that wherever the rites came from they have now their place in that Law, they have acquired Divine sanction, and have become part of the Divine system. They may have first belonged to Babylonian or other codes of law. But 'if we wish to understand their significance, we must study them in the place they now occupy, not in the position they held in heathen systems. The geological history of the stone in a quarry is a legitimate and interesting subject of enquiry, but it can throw little light on the place which a stone from that quarry occupies after the architect has shaped and fitted it into a building.'

But the final answer to the question is the result. If ignoration of the Higher Criticism and all its works brings out results that are good, good for the edifying of the Christian Church, that, says Mr. Moule, shows that the method also is good. And he moves unconcernedly but learnedly on to the end, making these dry bones live and propagate life beyond all conceiving.

Colonel G. A. Noyes of the Royal Artillery has published a translation of *Job* in the Hebrew rhythm (Luzac; 5s. net), the prose portions being omitted, as well as the Elihu episode. A specimen of the translation will give an idea of its success and worth. Take Job 19^{23-27}:

v.23 Oh! that my words were e'en now written down!
That they were in a book indited!
24 With lead and pen of iron,
Graven on the rock for aye!
25 But I know my redeemer lives;
On the dust he'll later stand;
26 After this my skin's destroyed,
Rid of flesh I shall see God;
27 See 'Him' for myself,
Mine eyes alone discern.
Within me my reins consume!

Sir J. G. Frazer takes a day off occasionally from the study of Religion, and edits English classics. His edition of *Cowper's Letters* in the 'Eversley' series is 'a possession for ever.' So now will be, and a dearer possession still, his selection from the *Essays of Joseph Addison* which Messrs. Macmillan have published in the same series (2 vols., 8s. net). A dearer possession; for in the *Cowper Letters* there is not the charm of the

Addison Essays, and in the editing of them there is nothing so exquisitely literary as the preface to these volumes. In that preface Sir J. G. Frazer pretends, with the delightful pretence of an Addisonian lover and in most humorous imitation of Addison's style, that he has paid a visit to Coverley Hall, has seen Sir Roger de Coverley's portrait, and has found a manuscript which tells the sad tale of Will Honeycomb's wedding.

Messrs. Macmillan have begun a re-issue of the *Dictionary of Political Economy*, edited by Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave, F.R.S. (vol. i. A–E, 21s. net). The first edition of this volume was issued in 1901. This is scarcely a new edition, as the text does not appear to be altered. But the list of authors is brought up to date, and it is interesting to see how many of them, known in the first edition by their names and nothing else, have now attained to positions of honour and responsibility. This is excellent proof of the editor's ability. For the foremost thing, if not the first, in the editing of a dictionary is to choose the right men for the articles. That Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave has not found it necessary to alter the arrangement of the book, or its individual articles, no doubt shows that he was equally successful throughout.

It is not a book to learn Economics from. No dictionary can be an elementary teacher. It is a work of reference. And it is one of the best works of reference that we have.

A single original suggestion is to the imaginative mind worth reams of repetition. In his book on *Economic Cycles: Their Law and Cause* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), Professor H. L. Moore, of Columbia University, makes an original and most fertile suggestion for the study of Economics. It is well known that there is an ebb and flow in economic life, a regular alternation of energetic, buoyant activity with a spiritless, depressed, and uncertain drifting. What is the cause of this alternation of periods of activity and depression? What is its law? These are the fundamental problems of economic dynamics the solution of which is offered in this Essay. 'Economists formulated the law of diminishing returns in agriculture, and traced its all-pervasive influence in the production and distribution of the product of industry. The desideratum of economic dynamics at the present time is the discovery of a law that shall be to a changing society what the law of diminishing returns in agriculture is to a society in a comparatively static condition. Now it is proverbial that the farmer is at the mercy of the weather. If it be true that the explanation of economic cycles is to be found in the law of supply of agricultural products, it is surely wise in a study of rhythmic, economic changes to inquire whether the law of the changing supply of raw material is not associated with a law of changing weather. Is there a well-defined law of changing weather?'

That is the question which Professor Moore has set himself for answer. Its answer demands some difficult mathematical computing and some equally difficult economical reasoning. But the student of Economics will go through it all gladly and will be rewarded.

Three essays which are as timely as they are valuable are given together in a volume entitled *Germany in the Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: At the University Press; 3s. 6d. net). The essays are on (1) 'The History of Theology,' by A. S. Peake, D.D.; (2) 'The History of Philosophy,' by Bernard Bosanquet, LL.D.; and (3) 'The History of Music,' by F. Bonavia. Thus each essay has been written by a thorough scholar in his department, and each is long enough for the writer to give us a sufficiently thorough account of its subject.

Professor Peake's work is all of the best kind—not scholarship only, but true Christian scholarship—and he has not been happier at any time than he is in this essay. He has a clear vision of the whole field; he has the skill to see the essential and the influential; he is concerned about the spelling of a name; and he can characterize a man or a movement in the fewest and most illuminating words. All that is in the man he is, and all that is here.

We notice just one thing in the essay and we do so with satisfaction. It is the justice done to Schleiermacher. It is astonishing that Schleiermacher has had so little direct influence in this country when he had so much in his own. The opinion we now hear freely expressed is that we have known too much of German theology. No, we have known too little; that is the trouble. We have known only the notorious elements in it, and these have been the worst elements. If we had known it more we should have been less hurt by

it. Few men know it in its length and breadth better than Dr. Peake, and there is no one of our time who is more truly an English theologian.

The Methodist Book Concern has re-issued a small volume of *Week-Day Prayers*, by Mr. Christian F. Reisner (35 cents), which originally appeared in 1909. This is one of the prayers:

'We thank Thee, Lord Jesus, for springtime-green, and flowers. We thank Thee for nature's cheer. We thank Thee for health, earth's sweetest boon. We thank Thee for enriching sorrows. We thank Thee for home comforts and loves. We thank Thee for crosses that lead to glory-crowns. We thank Thee for the sheaves to be reaped, if we faint not.

'Keep us worry free. Smooth our anxiety wrinkles. Teach us how to work without friction. Put the smile of heart-joy on our faces. May we do our best, and leave the rest with Thee. Gladden us with the constant consciousness of being co-workers with Thee. Fit us to be mankind's servant. Make us good so that we can be good for something in the Kingdom. Send us out to-day, O King of kings, under Thine eye and orders. Amen.'

The same publishers issue *The Heart of Prayer*, by Charles W. McCormick (25 cents net), and *Two Beautiful Prayers from the Lips of Jesus*, by William Nathan Tobie (50 cents net). The latter is a devotional study of the Lord's Prayer and the Prayer of Intercession.

Three volumes have appeared in succession written by the Rev. R. L. Ottley, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford. The first is called *The Rule of Life and Love*; the second, *The Rule of Faith and Hope*; and the third, which has just been published, *The Rule of Work and Worship* (Robert Scott; 5s. net). As their titles tell, they go together. They are Dr. Ottley's answer to the ancient question, What is the chief end of man? The second volume, quite recently reviewed, is an exposition of the Apostles' Creed. The third is an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. It is an exposition so successfully combining scholarship with unction that it must take its place among the few outstanding and undying expositions of the Lord's Prayer. Certainly neither student of the Gospels nor preacher of the gospel can afford to disregard it. There is nowhere to be found (unless it has escaped our notice) a more persuasive proof of the reading, 'Deliver us from the evil *one*.'

Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce's latest volume of sermons appears in Mr. Elliot Stock's 'Purple' series (1s. 6d. net). The title is *Seeing God*. There are five sermons, each of which offers some form of encouragement to a 'personal recognition of Divine Love.'

A volume of *Household Prayers for Morning Family Use* has been prepared by C. S., and published by Mr. Elliot Stock (2s. net). There are prayers for every day of four weeks, and at the end a few for special occasions.

After serving the newspapers well in the silly season, dreams have become the serious study of the man of science and the philosopher. Under the title of *Dreams* (Fisher Unwin; 2s. 6d. net) there has been published a lecture by Professor Henri Bergson which he delivered before the 'Institut psychologique' on March 26, 1901, and which appeared in this excellent English translation first of all in *The Independent* of America in October 1913. Professor Bergson shows that dreams are as subject to scientific law as the path of a projectile, but their laws are as difficult to discover as those of the weather. Is there no prediction then? Certainly: when their laws are known you can predict the results as accurately as you can tell when and where a projectile will fall and what damage it will do.

A small book of *Maxims from the Writings of Mgr. Benson* has been added to the 'Angelus' series (Washbourne). The maxims are short. Here, by way of example, are three of them.

'There is no happiness in the world comparable to that of the experience known as conversion.'

'If a person's conscience tells him a certain religion is true, he's bound to follow it, whatever happens.'

'Talents are distributed unevenly, it is true: to one ten, and to another five; but each has one pound, all alike.'

As often as it is said that Ritschlianism has spent its force, a new book appears to prove that

with the Christian thinker it is the most moving system of theology in existence. It does not always move to admiration of course, but it moves. Two books on Ritschlianism are reviewed this month. One of them is entitled *Facts and Values: A Study of the Ritschlian Method*, by Guy Halliday, M.A., B.D. (Christophers; 5s. net). The scope is deliberately restricted. But it is restricted to the most important matter in the system. And the restriction gives the more scope for satisfactory treatment. Mr. Halliday knows Ritschlianism; and more than that, he knows theology and psychology. He is a considerate but penetrating critic. On the Ritschlian attitude to Mysticism, for example, he shows the good that the Ritschlians have done in insisting upon the importance of an historical revelation. 'At the same time,' he says, 'even if Ritschl be right in his epistemology, with its confinement of knowledge to purely subjective phenomena, he is dealing in his theory solely with the conscious personality, which is by no means the whole of that personality; nor are the laws of the ordinary surface life necessarily applicable to the whole, since this includes the region of the subconscious, of which the range is unknown to us, and the laws are still unformulated. Any metaphysic can only be the rough simplification for the working purposes of life of a portion of human experience. There is still left ample room for the recognition of other experiences than those which can be reduced to a place in this working plan.'

Conflict in Prayer.

By the Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A., Hampstead.

Conflict there must be to the end; in another order there will be rest, but not here; there is one glory of the terrestrial, it is the glory of battle. When the last enemy is destroyed, '*then* cometh the end.' It is time to close the roll of this human story,—the age of struggle over, the age of fruition begun. The believers in war as a 'redeeming task' suggest, even to readers who hate their teaching, that they have seized a vital truth; even von Bernhardi makes many of us lay him down with the wonder in our minds—what is the truth which eludes us and baffles us in all this blasphemy? If he is wrong where is he wrong? Surely he is not wrong if he teaches that struggle has its appointed place in all created life. Surely conflict is in the spirit of the place. It is the thing *this* life is good for; what peace is given is the peace of soldiers in the trenches when there is a lull in the battle.

The apostle as he looked over the range of this earthly scene saw the Saviour going forth to subdue His enemies; one foe after another falling before Him; the last enemy was destroyed, then—the End! Life on this plane had achieved its purpose; out of the smoke and the fire of the conflict a race had been disciplined to share in the Divine Life; till then, not peace but a sword!

The quest of mankind must be not for a cessation from conflict, but *for a new field of battle.* The future depends upon the possibility of this discovery; is it or is it not possible for struggle to be transferred to the spiritual plane? Is it possible that mankind may fight, no longer upon the fields of France or Russia, but upon the plains of the inner life, and to compete in art, in science, in literature, in music, in faith. It is a long way from such a transformation. But meanwhile believers in Christ have to learn the secret of that inner conflict? They will not leave their place in the material strife; but even as they fight as good soldiers in the many phases of struggle, open to-day, they are called to explore the possibilities of conflict in prayer—they are called to wrestle, to meet God face to face, to put energy and courage and presence of mind into their life of prayer. But it appears as though this battlefield were overgrown with flowers; and there is only a dim memory of old forgotten battles.

For at least a generation Christian thought has been shy of the interpretation of prayer as a struggle. The pressure of modern science made that position hard to hold. It was hard enough to vindicate any place for prayer, and only possible, so many imagined, if the wrestling and striving were abandoned.

Though the position for thought is easier, the

effects are still felt in practice. The language of Scripture is retained; we sing the old hymns:

> Wrestling, I will not let Thee go
> Till I Thy name, Thy nature know;

but they sound false to many of us. When we pray, we have little that calls for such words. In prayer we have the mood of acquiescence; we know something of the rest of the soul in God; we accept in prayer His accomplished will. Outside there is enough place for strife, in the inner chamber let there be peace! It is no part of any one's duty to question the truth and the wonder of the prayer in which the soul is passive and resigned and shares

> the silence of eternity
> Interpreted by love;

this belongs to the treasure of the humble, which thieves cannot break through nor steal. But it must always be our wisdom to correct incomplete renderings of the Christian life by the standards of Christian experience as that is recorded for us in the history of the Church, but most of all as it is interpreted in the fulness of the New Testament. If something once familiar and fruitful has dropped out, how can we restore it? Here is a spiritual fact, partly lost,—the element of struggle is prayer. Can we discover what it means? Can we recover the secret?

Perhaps it may be urged that in the lower ranges of Christian life, stormy prayer has its place, but afterwards it is outgrown. Jacob wrestles with the angel; psalmists and prophets cry out in bitter remonstrance; they liken their inner life to a sea in which all God's billows go over them. But is not that a lower order of communion? This might be urged with more plausibility if the seal of our Lord were not set upon the struggle of the soul in communion with God. Gethsemane is a place which remains exceeding dark; but whatever else it is, it is a place of conflict. We have to do not with the experience of a Jacob wrestling by night, but of Jesus beneath the olive trees, shedding as it were drops of blood. Jesus, who prayed upon the hills of Galilee, knew what it was to spend Himself in prayer. The inner life was not for Him, and cannot be for us a land into which no alarms of war ever come. It cannot belong to the lower ranges of our spiritual being to watch and to pray with Jesus in Gethsemane.

The Christian saints in all ages have known that prayer was an energy of the soul only released and operative after conflict. Prayer was a powerful act. To-day we are fond of saying, 'Why go on with prayer? Why not *do something*?' The charge is perfectly justified if we consider our current methods in prayer. It would be without sting, if prayer were for us the experience which the saints have known. The wrestler does something; the soldier does something; the soul in prayer must learn what is meant by these metaphors; it will be necessary in all probability to restate the truth; that will come, if only the thing itself is familiar.

There is conflict in our inner life because we are *in the kingdoms of Nature and of Grace at the same time*, and any progress towards a spiritual life must be won by strife. First comes the natural man, afterwards the spiritual man; and then only, as a wise teacher said, the truly natural man. This phase of conflict has its classical expression in the story of Jacob wrestling at Peniel. He was about to meet Esau again, and the old life was coming back upon him. A pause had come. In that pause he wrestled with a man till the breaking of the day. It was a conflict at the heart of it between his old self and the new calling—between the natural man and the prince with God. 'That he should know his adversary at first may not have been meant. It was meant that he should be troubled, wrestled with, shaken to the very deeps of his nature, flung into a vague, deep dark conflict with powers but indistinctly seen' (Davidson). The story tells how a soul is won for the kingdom of God. 'If we could but know in that dark struggle that it is the Angel of the Covenant that is wrestling with us! He provokes the struggle that He may conquer us by being overcome.' Conflict there must be if we are to rise princes with God. The entrance into our race of these kings and priests unto God marks the opening of a new chapter in the history of the world. It may be that the ages are rightly divided by our knowledge of fossil remains; but that moment which saw the first lonely wrestler, facing with a new vision the daybreak, is a more certain guide to the right divisions in the history of this planet. But always and everywhere such new beginnings follow upon struggle.

It may be doubtful whether we have taken this fact into account in our prayers; have we fought fiercely, even madly, to win our complete deliverance into the liberty of the glory of the children of God? Or are we content to have a divided life?

Again; it is only in conflict, often a desperate unending conflict, that *the new truth and vision of God come to us.*

The battle for truth is more like a siege than a battle of the old order, won between dawn and sunset. Why it should be so, we may see only dimly. That it is so, we cannot doubt. It is the familiarity of this experience in the saints, which makes the Book of Job so eternally new. There each generation sees itself struggling out of a superseded rendering of the Truth. The patience of Job is his readiness to know nothing about his peculiar mysteries, rather than dishonour God with a lie. He goes into the thick tempest a knight of the Holy Ghost—a champion of the honour of God. And he is nearly lost. Many a soul has known the conflict of prayer because it is in the transition between an incomplete view, and something else not yet given. It is the conflict by which the soul is *disentangled*. Its language then is the language of defiance and exasperation and despair; but that is more acceptable to God than acquiescence in dishonour done to Him. Disentanglement brings conflict. It is the deliberate rejection of the easy way; it brings an inward poverty for the time, and there will be loneliness and darkness in that hour. But once more conflict is in the part. It is the appointed way. 'The way is the way.' And in that inward life he who has no sword must sell his cloak to buy one, if he would come to the intimate knowledge of God.

But it is only when we consider *vicarious prayer and the agony of intercession*, that we come to our greatest lack. There is a note missing in our Christian prayers to-day. Moses cried—'Yet now if thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which Thou hast written.' The Apostle Paul said, 'For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake.' The one story is an anticipation of Calvary, the other is a prolongation. But wherever princes with God have prayer, they have struggled and fought for the souls of men. Prayer with them is vicarious, and it is a steady, mighty, prolonged pressure of the will and spiritual being. There may not be storm or tumult; 'the gods approve the depth and not the tumult of man's soul'; but there is in intercession as it has been understood by Christian hearts, an element for which it is only possible to borrow metaphors from warfare. In intercessory prayer at its highest there is room for all the warrior virtues—a skilful reconnoitring—a right choice of ground and time, calmness, courage, perseverance, power to strike. A good soldier of Jesus Christ is one who knows that inner battlefield.

It is hard to tell why this should be. There might have been conceivably a race created, through whose life the life of God would have had an unimpeded way. There are faiths, especially in the East, which do interpret the world as being in all its phases an expression of the Divine, the tiger no less than the saint, the plague no less than the healing sunshine. But as it is, the Christian thinker cannot interpret life, except in the light of Christ and His work and His truth; he must believe that the purpose of the Holy God in His eternal love was to bring to Himself a race, which would respond to Him, understand Him, love Him, and enjoy Him for ever; and this response though it is His, must come through man; that Redeeming Love which is the one ultimate Power, must be *released* in mankind through man; God who is Love has always sought expression; He will only find it in this world from within the soul, and since the soul is never so much itself as in prayer, from within the soul in prayer.

There are men and women waiting for the redeeming love of God in Christ Jesus; that is the one healing power in the world; it is always seeking, always yearning, always breaking against its barriers; that redeeming love is released in the prayer of intercession. Why cannot God deal otherwise? Why should some wretched and miserable sinner wait till I pray? To put such questions is to raise the whole question of the Divine method revealed in Christ. The place of intercessory prayer is perfectly consistent with the gospel. Its difficulties are simply the difficulties of the wonderful and amazing gospel. They stand or fall together; and it is our wisdom in the spiritual world, as in all worlds, to deal with things as they are.

But if there is need for this *expression and release* of the Divine Love, why is there conflict?

Only hints can be given from that in our life which is nearest to the Divine activity in creation. There is the conflict of an artist with his medium of expression—which will always baffle him; he means so much, the instrument even when it is mastered, cannot say all that he means; art on a great scale always involves conflict—a conflict between the mind with its vision, and the instrument. We may say that in the intercession of the

soul for another, God is seeking expression, and the conflict is due in part to the inadequacy of the instrument. The thing is so wonderful, so alien to much in our human outlook, so transcendent, that its coming into a world like this through being like us means travail and strife.

In one of her sonnets Mrs. Browning speaks of the soul's expression:

> This song of soul I struggle to outbear
> Through portals of the sense sublime and whole,
> And utter all myself into the air:
> But if I did it—as the thunder-roll
> Breaks its own cloud,—my flesh would perish there
> Before that dread apocalypse of soul.

There must always be some such barrier between the soul and its perfect expression within the limits of this world. The interceding soul must be doomed to struggle because it is within two worlds, the one not yet known in all the fulness of its resources and powers. The intercession of the soul is a divine act belonging to that other unseen and eternal order and conditioned by the limitations of our being; that is why from our side it has the bearing of conflict, *it is conflict*; what it looks like from God's side, we cannot tell yet; from this side it is often like a wrestling with a reluctant God for the souls of men; but the divine wrestler is playing for a fall, and loves to be worsted. What if all the time it is His own love struggling within us to expression and release?

'Why pray? why not do something?' If we only prayed in Christ, if we only offered all our powers to Him, we should be doing something—we should be doing what He does for ever; we should work in the fellowship of the Cross; we should be not only good soldiers of Christ, but ourselves His battlefields, and the scenes of His latest victories.

Gog and Magog.

By Professor S. H. Hooke, M.A., Victoria College, Toronto.

At a time when the Christian Church, already prepared by the recent remarkable revival of interest in Apocalyptic studies, is being forced by the world drama of to-day to think of Armageddon and its issues, the following brief summary of the information available concerning Gog and Magog, the mysterious protagonists of the final struggle, may be of interest. The essence of Christian Apocalyptic is hope. There is always God at the end. Coventry Patmore has expressed the familiar thought finely:

> Under the everchanging clouds of doubt,
> When others cry,
> The stars, if stars there were,
> Are quenched and out;
> To him, uplooking to the hills for aid,
> Appear at need displayed
> Gaps in the low hung gloom,
> And, bright in air,
> Orion or the Bear.

I. Etymology.

For fuller discussion of the etymology of the name 'Gog' the reader is referred to the articles on 'Gog' and 'Magog' in *H.D.B.* It will be sufficient here to sum up the available data very briefly. The name 'Gog' has been connected with (1) *Gugu*, the cuneiform form of Gyges king of Lydia, 687–653 B.C.; (2) *Gâgu*, ruler of the land of Sakhi, a district N. of Assyria, mentioned in the Annals of Asshurbanipal. The name Magog has been explained as: (1) a contraction of *Mat-gog*, 'the land of Gog,' or *Mat-gagaia*, 'the land of Gagaia,' a people mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna tablets; *Mat* being the Assyrian word for 'land.' (2) It has been read as *Migdon*, and connected with Har-Magedon (Cheyne). Other etymologies from Persian and Indo-European sources have been offered, but need not be discussed here.

What little evidence of an etymological nature there is seems to point towards an original geographical and etymological assignment of Gog to the peoples dwelling on the shores of the Euxine, such as the Cimmerians (Gomer), the Tabali and Mushku of the Assyrian inscriptions (Tubal and Mesech), and others. Hence in the popular imagination Gog belongs to the generic class of the Northern peoples. But by the time of the N.T. writers the term has totally lost any vague geographical sense which it may have had in Ezekiel's time. Hence the reader must be referred for a fuller discussion

of the question to the articles mentioned above, to Driver's *Commentary on Genesis* (10[2]), and to Redpath's *Commentary on Ezekiel* (38[1]).

II. Occurrences of the Name.

1. In the O.T. the references are: Gn 10[2], where Magog is mentioned alone among the descendants of Japheth; Ezk 38–39, in a description of the final assault against Jerusalem and the restored remnant. Possibly we should include here the remarkable LXX version of Nu 24[7]: 'There shall come forth a man from his seed, and shall bear rule over many nations, and (his) kingdom shall be higher than *Gog*.' It is possible that this reading may represent the true Hebrew text, as *Agag* offers no intelligible sense.

2. *Apocalyptic Literature.*—In the Jewish Apocalyptic the conception is frequently found in a general form, but there is no occurrence of a specific reference to the final enemy under the name of Gog and Magog. These names are only found in Jub 8[25] 9[8] in a topographical sense, and in Sibyllines iii. 319, 512, where Gog and Magog are identified as rivers of Ethiopia. The reference may possibly be to the Nubians who returned from Egypt with Antiochus Epiphanes when he desecrated the temple. The more important passages for the general conception of the final assault are Sib iii. 663 ff., Eth. En 56 62[12] 90[16], Ass. Mos 8[1ff.], Apoc. Bar 40[1], 2 Es 5[6] 13[33ff.], Ps. Sol 2[28-34], Jud 16[18].

3. *N.T. Literature.*—The only passage containing a specific reference to Gog and Magog is Rev 20[7-10]. The author of the Apocalypse represents a double assault. The first is led by the beast and the false prophet, *i.e.* the Roman Empire combined with the Antichrist, and takes place before the setting up of the millennial Messianic kingdom on earth. This attack is defeated by the Messiah in person at the head of the armies of heaven. The second attack takes place at the close of the earthly Messianic kingdom. Satan, who has been bound in the Abyss during the kingdom, is loosed, and gathers Gog and Magog, the nations in the four corners of the earth, against 'the camp of the saints,' 'the beloved City.' This attack is annihilated by fire coming down from God out of heaven. It is followed by the passing away of heaven and earth, and the final sessional judgment.

Other apocalyptic passages in the N.T. referring in general terms to the final assault are Mt 24[15], Mk 13[14] [Lk 21[20-24]?], 2 Th 2[3-8].

4. *Rabbinical Literature.*—There are a number of specific references to Gog and Magog in Rabbinical literature. Only a few of the more important can be cited. There is the well-known passage in the Jerus. Targ. on Nu 11[27]: 'On the last day Gog and Magog and their army will march against Jerusalem.' *Sanh.* 11: 'Gog and Magog, the future nations who will declare war against the Messiah'; 'many more years will be the war of Gog and Magog, and the remainder will be the days of the Messiah.' This latter passage is represented as being from a Persian source. The Messiah ben Joseph is to conquer Rome but to fall before Gog. A long interval elapses between the fall of Rome and the fall of Gog (*Pesik. R.* 12, 37; *Pesik.* 22, 148*a*; *Gen. R.* 73; *B.B.* 123*b*). Other passages are *B. b. berach.* 7*b*, *Edujoth* ii. 10, *Mechilta* 41*a*, 50*b*, 51*a*, *Sifre* 143*a*, *Sifra* 112*c*, *Aboda Zara* i. f. 36.

5. *Arabic Literature.*—In the Koran the Gog and Magog conception has received a large amount of mythical accretion. They are called Yajuj and Majuj, and are represented as having been shut up by Alexander the Great within a boundary wall. This wall will be broken down before the day of Judgment, and the hosts of Yajuj and Majuj will come forth to be ultimately destroyed by God.

6. *Patristic Literature.*—In the Apostolic Fathers there is no specific mention of Gog and Magog, and that cycle of Apocalyptic events, consisting in the final hostile assault and defeat, is hardly represented at all. Irenæus, who may be taken to represent the traditional point of view of the Eschatology of the Church, deals fully with Antichrist and the interpretation of his number (*Adv. Hær.* v. 30), but passes over in silence the second assault after the Millennial reign. Hippolyus also, in *de Christ. et Antich.* 50, follows Irenæus in his interpretation the mystic number, but passes over Gog and Magog in silence. Possibly the Church of the Apostolic Age had come to regard the two assaults described by the author of the Apocalypse as one, namely, the pre-millennial assault led by the beast and the false prophet.

III. Place of the Gog-Magog Conception in the General Scheme of Apocalyptic.

1. *Period Theory.*—Modern investigation has made it very clear that the various Apocalyptic schemes of Babylonia, Persia, and the Jews, rest

upon a basis of world-periods. The calculation and number of these periods vary, but every scheme exhibits this feature. Every period is closed by disasters of a more or less stereotyped character.

2. *Pre-Messianic woes.*—These disasters or woes (חבלי המשיח), 'pangs of the Messiah' as they came to be called in later Judaism, fall into three main classes: (i.) An intensification of moral and physical evils. These include the ἀπόστασις of 2 Th 2^3 (note the article, ἡ ἀπόστασις, i.e. *the well-known* apostasy), the waxing cold of love, Mt. $24^{11.12}$, and similar phenomena described in Dn 11^{35}, 1 Ti 4^1, 2 Ti 3^{1-5}. In the physical sphere occur wars, famines, pestilences, and plagues of various kinds (Mk $13^{7.8}$). (ii.) The assault of hostile powers against God and Messiah, against the 'navel of the earth,' against Jerusalem, against the holy city, etc. This group assumes various forms in various schemes, all ultimately to be traced back to the supreme conflict between good and evil, light and darkness. It is possible that the particular form which the tradition has assumed in later Jewish thought is due to Persian influence (see Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, p. 129 f.). To this group of disasters belongs the Gog-Magog conception. (iii.) The darkening of sun and moon, and the occurrence of earthquakes. This group does not fall to be discussed here.

3. *The Northern enemy.*—The Gog-Magog conception falls more precisely under the general head of the 'Northern Enemy' in Jewish eschatology. The North assumes a special Apocalyptic significance in the prophets as the source of judgment and the latter-day disasters. But in the Apostolic Age, Gog and Magog are completely detached from any special topographical connexion and become the nations from 'the four corners of the earth.'

4. *Gog and Messiah.*—In later Rabbinical eschatology there is a considerable development of the part played by Messiah in the final act of the Apocalyptic drama. A distinction is drawn between Messiah ben Joseph and Messiah ben David, in order to satisfy exegetical requirements in the interpretation of the blessing of Ephraim (Dt 33^{17}). The Messiah ben Joseph is slain in the great battle with Gog and Magog, while Messiah ben David slays the leader of the hosts with the breath of his mouth. No trace of this scheme of the finale appears in the Apostolic Christian literature. In Revelation the destruction of the hosts of Gog and Magog takes place through the direct intervention of God from heaven by fire.

Conclusion.—It is easy to see that the older clear-cut outlines of the scheme of the end are becoming blurred. In general the Christian writers of the Apostolic Age concentrate their attention on the mystic figure of Antichrist which is gradually undergoing spiritualization under the form of the advance of moral evil and heresy in the Church. The sense of a great final conflict is not lost, but is passing into a deeper and more spiritual form. To the writer of the Apocalypse the Gog-Magog conflict seems to represent the sense that even the old Messianic hope and kingdom cannot finally purge the earth of evil and end the age-long conflict. God alone can do it, and His intervention brings about the end of the heaven and earth, the theatre of the conflict, and ushers in the final judgment.

In the Study.

Few books are more welcome than those which the Rev. F. W. Boreham is sending us from Hobart in Tasmania. They are the books of a minister of the gospel who never forgets his high calling, and of a master of the English tongue who cannot deny his great gift of imaginative writing. Are their contents sermons? There is a text of Scripture lurking in every chapter. If they are, we should like to know what is the effect of *this* kind of preaching in the way of church attendance and the spread of the gospel. We could commend it for imitation, but, alas! how few of our preachers have trained their imagination, how few have discovered that there is an imagination to be trained!

We must quote one of the chapters of Mr. Boreham's new book, and we shall quote rather a long one. We must not suggest that all the chapters have this fulness of teaching and this

pathos, but they are all worthy of their place in the book where this is found, and of which the title is *The Golden Milestone* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net).

The Little Palace Beautiful.

There are only four children in the wide, wide world, and each of us is the parent of at least one of them. I will tell how I made the discovery. I was going along the road that Bunyan's pilgrim travelled, and was nearing the Delectable Mountains. As Christian and Hopeful drew near those glorious hills, with their gardens and their orchards, their fountains and their vineyards, they were in such terror, because of their recent adventure with Giant Despair, that they looked aside neither to the right hand nor to the left. That is how they missed the Little Palace Beautiful. It stands among the trees of the valley just off the main road. It is a palace in miniature. Such a dainty little dwelling! Such lovely flowers in the garden! Such a ceaseless chorus of song from all the forest around! It is like a nest beautifully built among the trees. And about the garden and the home itself I saw the angels moving. They kept guard over it night and day. There are only four charming little rooms, and in those pretty rooms I found the children sleeping. And what I saw I here set down.

I.

In a sunless room that faces the south, a room whose name is Fancy, I found *the Little Child that Never Was*. And *the Little Child that Never Was* is an exquisitely beautiful child. He is the little child of all lonely men and lonely women, the child of their dreams and their fancies, the child that will never be born. He is the son of the solitary. Let me cite two instances as typical of many. The one shall be the case of a man and the other of a woman. Professor Herkless, in his *Life of Francis d'Assisi*, tells us how Francis was torn between the monastic life on the one hand and the domestic life on the other. He longed to be a monk and to dedicate himself to poverty and pilgrimage. And yet he loved a sweet and noble and gracious woman. He wrestled with his alternatives, and at length, through an agony of tears, he chose the cloak and the cowl. But still the lovely face haunted him by cloister and by shrine. And one radiant moonlight night, when the earth was wrapped in snow, the brethren of the monastery saw him rise at dead of night. He went out into the grounds and, in the silvery moonlight, fashioned out of the snow with deft artistic fingers the images of a lovely woman and a group of fair little children. He arranged them in a circle, and sat with them, and, giving rein to his fancy, tasted for one delicious hour the ecstasies of hearth and home, the joys of life and love. Then, solemnly rising, he kissed them all a tearful and final farewell, renounced such raptures for ever, and reentered the monastery. That night the deep impressive eyes of Francis looked full into the face of *the Little Child that Never Was*.

For the womanhood let Ada Cambridge speak. In *The Hand in the Dark and Other Verses*, she has a touching little poem that she calls 'The Virgin Martyr.' It might just as well have been called '*The Little Child that Never Was*.'

Every wild she-bird has nest and mate in the warm April weather,
But a captive woman, made for love, no mate, no nest, has she.
In the spring of young desire, young men and maids are wed together.
And the happy mothers flaunt their bliss for all the world to see.
Nature's sacramental feast for them — an empty board for me.

I, a young maid once, an old maid now, deposed, despised, forgotten—
I, like them, have thrilled with passion and have dreamed of nuptial rest,
Of the trembling life within me of my children unbegotten,
Of a breathing new-born body to my yearning bosom prest,
Of the rapture of a little soft mouth drinking at my breast.

Time, that heals so many sorrows, keeps mine ever-freshly aching.
Though my face is growing furrowed and my brown hair turning white.
Still I mourn my irremediable loss, asleep or waking;
Still I hear my son's voice calling 'Mother' in the dead of night,
And am haunted by my girl's eyes that will never see the light.

O my children that I might have had! My children lost for ever!
O the goodly years that might have been, now desolate and bare!
O God, what have I lacked, what have I done, that I should never
Take my birthright like the others, take the crown that women wear,
And possess the common heritage to which all flesh is heir?

I said that *the Little Child that Never Was* is a very beautiful child. He is absolutely without faults or flaws or disfigurements of any kind. He is all, *all*, ALL that his father, his mother, would have him to be. And he has a great work to do in the world—that *Little Child that Never Was*. He will either sweeten the life of his poor lonely father or mother or else make it as bitter as wormwood. He will wonderfully soften or cruelly harden them. *The Little Child that Never Was* calls his solitary father and lonely mother to the service of the world's childhood. It is a great thing for the world that there are men and women with no children of their own. For there are little children without fathers and without mothers, and there are little children with fathers and mothers who would be better off if they had none. And the lonely men and women are called by *the Little Child that Never Was* to devote their lives to the service of the lonely little children. And in ministering to the world's childhood they will lose their loneliness and their longing, for *the Little Child that Never Was* will become incarnate in the little children around them, and they will hear his laughter and wipe away his tears after all.

II.

In the room that faces the west and is flooded with the sunset glory, a room called Memory, I found *the Little Child that Was*. And if Ada Cambridge has described *the Little Child that Never Was*, Josephine Dodge Daskam has done so much for *the Little Child that Was*. It occurs in her poem on 'Motherhood.'

The night throbs on; oh, let me pray, dear Lord!
Crush off his name a moment from my mouth.
To Thee my eyes would turn, but they go back,
Back to my arm beside me where he lay—
So little, Lord, so little and so warm!
I cannot think that Thou hadst need of him!
He was so little, Lord, he cannot sing,
He cannot praise Thee; all his life had learned
Was to hold fast my kisses in the night.
Forgive me, Lord, but I am sick with grief,
And tired of tears and cold to comforting.
Thou art wise, I know, and tender, aye, and good,
Thou hast my child, and he is safe in Thee,
And I believe—
Ah, God, my child shall go
Orphaned among the angels! All alone,
So little and alone! He knows not Thee,
He only knows his mother—give him back!

And *the Little Child that Was* is also an exquisitely beautiful child, a child that is always a child, a child that never grows up. I remember hearing a Sunday-school superintendent in England tell a story of a shepherd who could not get his flock to cross a narrow bridge that spanned a silver stream. At last he took a lamb in his arms and crossed. The mother instantly dashed across after him, and the whole flock scampered at her heels. I often think of the gentle story when I ponder on *the Little Child that Was*. And *the Little Child that Was* also has a great work to do in the world. The classical example is the story of Mrs. Josephine Butler. We all remember with a shudder the story of that holiday—the father and mother in Europe, the little girlie left at home. And at last the night came when father and mother were expected. And in the night there was the sound of wheels and the commotion in the great hall below. The excited little daughter sprang from her bed, rushed out into the corridor, jumped up on to the banister rail to peer over and see 'dadda' and 'mamma' again. And then—the lost balance! the awful fall! 'Never,' says Mrs. Butler, 'never can I lose that memory, the fall, the sudden cry, and then the silence. It was pitiful to see her, helpless in her father's arms, her little drooping head resting on his shoulder, and her beautiful golden hair all stained with blood, falling over his arm. Would to God that I had died that death for her! If only we had been permitted one look, one moment of recognition!' Here, then, is a picture from life of *the Little Child that Was!* And we all know what resulted. Mrs. Josephine

Butler could find no comfort until she rose from her grief and devoted herself to all the wayward and motherless daughters of the great world outside, and everybody who knows the story of that greatly heroic life for the world's womanhood thanks God for that *Little Child that Was*. *The Little Child that Was* calls, not for sorrow, but for service.

III.

In a room called Experience, a room that faces the north and gets all the sun, I found *the Little Child that Is*. What a wonder he is, to be sure! I am not surprised that people have asked, 'What are little boys made of?' Nor am I surprised at the divergence which has characterized the replies. But boys and girls are made neither of sugar and spice nor of snips and snails. *The Little Child that Is* is made of Curiosity, Ambition, and Imagination. And these are all fine things. Curiosity, rightly developed, has led all our explorers across uncharted seas and untrodden continents, and has lured our scientists and inventors to their triumphs and their fame. But it needs educating. It is no good telling a child that he must not go to the cupboard. You only inflame his desire to go. You must satisfy him in some way, either that there is nothing in the cupboard that he needs, or that there is good reason why he should be forbidden from approaching it. The universe is full of wonderful and tantalizing cupboards. And half the damage done to fair young lives is caused through our insane way of telling them on no account to look into a certain cupboard. 'Don't look at the cupboard!' 'Don't think of the cupboard!' 'Don't read of the cupboard!' we cry, until we have so roused their innate curiosity that the forbidden cupboard becomes the one topic of their thought and speculation. The high art of training young people, all of whom are in the continental and most romantic stage of discovery, lies in the adoption of some sane and reasonable and satisfying attitude towards the world's wonderful cupboards.

The same is true of Ambition and Imagination. *The Little Child that Is* dearly loves to excel. He wants to win. And the wise parent will not seek to crush his pride of achievement, but to educate it. We must point him out the heights that are best worth climbing, the goals that are best worth reaching, the prizes that are best worth winning. And the culture of the Imagination, too, is surely well worth while. *The Little Child that Is* has an amazing creative faculty. He peoples every crack and crevice in the solar system with fairies and elves, hobgoblins and ghouls. It is the sense of the Infinite stirring within him. If only we could preserve it to him! What a world this would be if we had a touch of imagination left in it! Our churches are languishing for it. One flash of real imagination would save us from that detachment from reality which is the secret of half our failure. The imaginative faculties of *the Little Child that Is* would enable us preachers to project ourselves into the real lives of our people and to say the things that would really help them. And the world needs it, too. 'I understand now,' says Mr. H. G. Wells, 'why modern electioneering is more than half of it denunciation. There is nothing constructive. That calls for the creative imagination, and few are able to respond to that call.'

Here, then, is your *Little Child that Is*! He is made up of these three priceless ingredients—Curiosity, Ambition, and Imagination. Crush his curiosity, and you will find him sinister, self-satisfied, knowing all he cares to know. Crush his ambition, and you will find him, hands in pockets, at the street corner. Crush his imagination, and you rob him of his power to lead this old world into new joys and new experiences. The father and mother to whom *the Little Child that Is* has come have already tasted of the bliss of heaven; but a fearful responsibility attends their rapture.

IV.

And in a room whose window faces the east, the sunrise, a room called Hope, I found *the Little Child that Is to Be*. A wonderful, wonderful child is he—*the Little Child that Is to Be*. I often feel that I should like to take every young fellow in my congregation into this room that faces the sunrise and show him this sweet and slumbering angel-face. And as he looks down upon the head on the pillow I would say, 'Take care, when you are making love to the girl of your fancy, that you are securing for *the Little Child that Is to Be* a mother capable of maintaining the great and holy traditions of motherhood. Take care that you are winning to yourself a woman whom you can set with pride and confidence before the eye of *the Little Child that Is to Be*, as the embodiment of all that is pure and noble and unselfish and true! And I often feel

that I should like to take every girl in my congregation into this little room with the eastern window. And, as she gazed tenderly down into the sleeping face of *the Little Child that Is to Be*, I would say to her, 'Take care, when you ally yourself with the lover of your fancy, that you are securing for *the Little Child that Is to Be* a father to whom you may always point with proud motherly affection! Take care that you are setting before the eyes of *the Little Child that Is to Be*, when he wakes up, a father whose character he may copy and in whose safe footprints he may plant his own! Take care! Take care!' And I would have both young men and maidens, as they stand beside this sleeping angel, to remember that whenever they yield to temptation they are striking a more terrible blow at *the Little Child that Is to Be* than they will ever be able to strike him with clenched fist. And whenever they resist and overcome temptation they are securing for *the Little Child that Is to Be* a finer heritage than any they will ever leave him in their wills. 'Take care, take care,' I would say to to every man and maiden, 'take the greatest, tenderest care of *the Little Child that Is to Be*!'

V.

I said when I began that there are only four children in the wide, wide world, and that every one of us is the parent of at least one of them. That is so. Every man and woman on the face of the globe has a child of his own—one or other of these four. And a little child is always a leader. 'A little child shall lead them.' And be sure *the Little Child that Never Was*, *the Little Child that Was*, *the Little Child that Is*, and *the Little Child that Is to Be* have come stealing into all our hearts and all our homes that they may lead us, their dusty, world-stained fathers and mothers, out of our sins and out of ourselves to the dear feet of that Holy Saviour in whose radiant and gracious presence the little children always felt at home.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

Easter—1915.

'He is not here, but is risen.'—Lk 24[6].

My boys and girls, this is Easter morning—Easter morning, 1915.

You know that with people who love the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, Easter is counted a time for rejoicing. I believe that amongst your grown-up friends here, there are many who came into church with very thankful hearts indeed. Coming along, they felt so glad that they wanted to say to some of the other church-going people, 'Don't you love Easter Sunday? I think it is the next best day to Christmas.' Ministers have often said things like that to you. But I believe that even while they were saying them, they felt that it was impossible for boys and girls really to understand the joy of the Resurrection. To your fathers and mothers, it means a story of joy coming after great sorrow—of life coming after death. Not one of us likes to speak to boys and girls about death, and that simply because we want you to think about life. But on this Easter morning of 1915, we cannot help asking ourselves, 'Why should it be so?'

To-day, we are feeling happy, because Christians have rejoiced in Christ's resurrection for hundreds of years. We all know that He died upon the cross, but—did you ever think what His death must have meant to His disciples? They had been *so* happy during the three years they had been in their Master's company. They wished for no happier heaven than to be beside Him. There was something of pride in their happiness too, for, had not Jesus the power to work wonderful miracles—even to raise the dead to life? How dark, then, must that day have seemed to them when He was crucified, and they heard the mocking tone of those who said, 'Ah! He saved others, but he could not save himself.' And—we have read the story so often—I do not think it is possible for you boys and girls, or any of us, to think ourselves back to that burst of sudden happiness that came to the two Marys—they were weeping—when they saw the angels at the tomb, and heard what they said.

A good many years ago, I read in the newspapers of a terrible mining disaster. It happened in Fifeshire. Day after day, there appeared news of numbers of men having been rescued. But after nearly a week had passed, sorrowful women and children sat from early morning to late at night at the pithead, hoping and hoping for a sight of those who had gone down one day, and had never come back. At last, when nearly all hope had fled, and despair had settled on the waiting company, the rescuers appeared. They

had two miners with them; but so faint that they could not walk, they had to be supported. I do not remember what was said about their wives and children, or if they had any. But a very strange feeling came over me when I read how those sad and weary women wept for joy, as they went forward and kissed the dear grimy faces.

In a way, nothing could be farther apart from Christ's resurrection. *It* was all beautiful. His sepulchre was hewn out of the rock, and no one had ever been laid in it. Loving hands had dressed Him in beautifully white linen, and the two Marys were met by men in shining garments. But I think their joy was akin to the joy of the humble women in the mining village—it was a wonderful joy full of thankfulness which they could not express.

As I said, it is often felt that the joy of Easter has in it something beyond the understanding of boys and girls. This year, however, our hearts are in a manner relieved. We can talk to you about Easter, as we have never talked before. Do you wonder how this is so? For months and months many grown-up people have been preaching Easter sermons to themselves—Easter sermons, too, that are full of a great and deep joy, and that you could understand. In your homes you have heard your fathers and mothers talking very sorrowfully. You could not help thinking about death as they talked, for you knew that your big brothers and many of your friends were facing it. To many boys and girls—to some, I believe, in this church—the experiences of these past months have been like following their fathers and mothers through the Valley of the Shadow of Death. One mother I know is very timid—she keeps fearing that the worst will happen, and that makes her little girls frightened too.

But—isn't it sometimes a blessing to be able to use that little word?—the resurrection of Jesus Christ has made this life just a story of dying and living again.

A very brave mother said to me the other day, 'My boy has gone, and now I can ask God's blessing upon him, for I was unhappy till he went.' Her mind was on the Resurrection. In days like these, some people can be glad even in the presence of Death; out of all this sorrow and darkness they look for a new and better nation. My boys and girls, there is no reason why that new nation should not be pure as the men in white garments. It was needful that even you should know sorrow, for we were all forgetting about God.

A new and risen kingdom of Great Britain! You are to be the men and women of it. To you will fall the duty of upholding its honour. We know that you are not afraid of death in battle for the right; your brothers have shown us that. And they are leaving with you something to remember—and keep. We call it a heritage. Will each of you resolve that in your thoughts and your words you will never prove unworthy of it? If you—if all the children in Scotland, and England, and Ireland do this, the new and risen Great Britain will shine with a light that will throw its beams into every corner of the world. From Christ who died and rose again we get the light that is helping us through our present sorrow.

Will you pray to God to help you to play your part?

II.

The Rev. C. E. Stone, the author of *The Angel in the Corner*, has issued another volume of 'Talks to Children,' to which he has given the name of *Flowers of Gold* (Robert Scott; 2s. net). Here is a fair example of the Talks, both for length and for quality:

Prickles.

Micah 7^4.

'The best of them is as a briar,' says Micah. What does he mean? You go and buy perhaps a pound or two of nuts. When you examine them you find some have only dust inside and some are withered and dried. They are a poor lot, and so you say, 'The best of them are only like peas.' And Micah thought the people were a poor lot. Why, he said, the very best of them are only like briars with a little blossom and plenty of thorns. I am afraid it is true of us all. The best men and women I know are 'briars' sometimes, and so are the best boys and girls.

When are best people briars? When they are tired. A man who has been at work all day and comes home overtired is apt to be prickly. So are you. There was the long morning at school, then games, then school again, then lessons at home, and as a result you were so tired that you were

cross, and nobody could speak to you without getting a sharp answer. When you feel like that, tell people so, and ask them not to bother you. Better still, go to bed and sleep it off. Jesus was often tired, but He was never cross. Why should you be?

When are the best people briars? When they are disappointed. Father expected a cheque or a big order, and as it did not come, he went home cross. Mother thought she was going to have that new dress, but was not able to get it, and it upset her. You did not get many presents on your birthday, could not go for that outing, had to stop in because of the rain, and as a result you were 'prickly.' How silly it is! Jesus, tired and hungry, came to a village where He expected to spend the night, but they would not let Him. The disciples were cross, but He was not. He expected people to love Him and believe in Him, but they sneered at and hated Him. Yet He was not cross. He was often disappointed, but never irritable and prickly. Next time you feel that way, go to Him and say, Help me to bear disappointment as You did.

When are the best people briary? When they cannot get their own way. If the minister cannot have his way, he is inclined to be nasty; so is the deacon. If the husband or the wife cannot have all their own way they sometimes quarrel. And if you cannot go to the pictures, cannot have those friends in to tea, cannot have that pocket-money, what trouble there is with you. You are as prickly as a porcupine with all his quills standing up.

Now suppose you could have all your own way, and people never opposed you and let you do as you liked and have what you wanted. That would be jolly. Would it? You would become a spoilt child, a nuisance to everybody, and of no use in the world. And that is why God won't let me, nor father, nor mother, have all our own way; and that is why He will not let you have all yours; because He is determined you shall not be spoilt. Next time you are inclined to be prickly, remember that, and it will help you to be content. Jesus did not have all His own way; but it did not make Him cross. He said: 'Thy will, not mine, be done.' And all must try and learn that lesson. If we do, we shall become roses, instead of briars.

III.

How to be a hero.

'We were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.'—Nu 13^{33}.

'The Lord is with us: fear them not.'—Nu 14^{9}.

When the Children of Israel were on the borders of the Promised Land, Moses sent forward twelve spies—one from each tribe—to find out all about the land. These men received orders to explore the country, and discover whether the soil was fertile or not, what sort of crops grew there, and whether it was well wooded or not. They were also to find out about the inhabitants—whether they were strong or weak, good or bad, and whether they lived in camps or in strongholds. Lastly, they were to bring back samples of the fruit of the land.

When the men returned after forty days, they were divided into two distinct groups. All of them were agreed that for the most part the land was very fruitful, and to prove it they brought back a bunch of grapes, so large and heavy that it had to be carried on a staff between two men. But only so far did their opinions agree. When they came to tell of the inhabitants of the land and of their cities, the spies were divided.

The first group was much the larger, and consisted of ten men. These men had allowed their fears to get the better of them. 'The country,' said they, 'is overrun with wild and warlike tribes, the cities are surrounded with walls—very high and very strong,—and we saw enormous giants there—so big that we felt like grasshoppers in their sight.'

The second group contained only two men, Caleb and Joshua. These two looked at things in a different light, because they remembered what the other men forgot—or chose to forget—that God was with them, and would not forsake them, for He had promised them the land, and willed that they should now go up and possess it. 'Let us go up at once,' said Caleb, 'for we are well able to overcome it.' Then they both reminded the Israelites of God's protecting presence. 'The Lord is with us,' they said: 'fear them not.'

How different are the reports of these two sets of men. The frenzied exaggerations of the ten spies, and the calm, clear, courageous words of Caleb and Joshua. Yet the Israelites listened to the ten cowards instead of to the two brave men.

They wept, and wailed, and murmured against God. They even suggested returning to Egypt, and all the thanks Caleb and Joshua received for their brave stand was a volley of stones.

So God decreed that none of these foolish Israelites should ever enter the Promised Land. They had made their choice. They might have gone on into that rich and fertile country and enjoyed its plenty, but, rather than face a few dangers,—dangers through which God had promised to bring them,—they preferred to stay in the barren wilderness, or return to the persecutions of Egypt. God punished them by ordaining that they should wander in the Wilderness for forty years, that they should die there, and that only their children should enter the Land of Promise. Caleb and Joshua alone were allowed to reach it.

We have all to meet dangers and difficulties in this life, and the way we meet them determines what sort of men and women we are. There are just two kinds of people in the world—those who face up to their difficulties, and those who turn their backs on them and run away. The first are in the ranks of the brave men, the last in the ranks of the cowards. The first often suffer hardship and peril, but from amongst them come the heroes of the world; the last have an easier time, but they never do anything worth doing in the world. To which side would you prefer to belong?

Before we go further I want you to understand clearly what is really meant by the word 'coward,' because it is a word that is very often misused. Remember it doesn't mean you are a coward if you are afraid of things. It is not the people who see no danger that are the bravest, but the people who fully realize the danger, and yet face it all the time. Some people are born brave; they have little imagination, and it is no effort to them to keep cool. Others are possessed of very vivid imaginations, and see the dangers as they are, and often very much worse than they are. Somehow, I have an idea that Joshua belonged to this class; and the reason why I think so is, that when, later on, Joshua was about to lead the Children of Israel into the Holy Land, he was told repeatedly, first by Moses and then by God, to 'be strong and of a good courage.' It seemed as if he needed a lot of cheering and encouraging. Yet Joshua never turned aside from the right path. His was a very difficult task, but whatever his fears may have been he marched straight on, and led the Children of Israel safely into the Land of Promise.

I want to speak first of our *Imaginary Difficulties*.

The reason why I am putting them first is because I know they are very real to children, and often much worse to face than the real difficulties. I wonder how many of you are afraid to go into a dark room, or to sleep in one. Some boys and girls are very much afraid of this. Fear makes them picture all sorts of terrors. Yet there is nothing in the room at night that was not there in the daytime, and God is just as truly with you as He was when the sun shone. The wrong way to overcome this difficulty is to give way to your fears, and not venture into the room. The right way is to go in bravely in spite of your fears. By degrees you will become less and less frightened, and all the time you will be growing into a hero.

Have you ever seen a horse shying at a bit of white paper on the roadside? The wise and kind rider leads his horse up to the paper so that he may have a good look at it and see that there is no harm in it. That is how we must treat our imaginary difficulties.

Now for the *Real Difficulties*. First among them I shall put our *Tasks*.

That word includes a great deal—it includes our lessons, our duties, and, later on, our daily work, or our business. Sometimes our lessons are a terrible worry. They are difficult to understand, and we would much rather be out playing with other boys and girls. Or perhaps it is a difficult piece of music that taxes our patience, and we feel inclined to throw it aside and take something easier. Well, you can do so if you like—and be a coward. Remember it is only by strenuous effort and hard work you can become brave or great men and women.

Have you ever passed through the station at Newcastle? Next time you do, be sure to look out of the window and you will see a curious thing on the platform—a thing that you think must have got into that place by mistake. What is it? Just a funny, old, ramshackle-looking engine. Yet that engine is a monument to a man of whom Newcastle is justly proud—George Stephenson, who invented the first railway engine. That boy won

his way by sheer pluck and perseverance. He never allowed any difficulty to get the better of him. He began life as a little herd-boy at twopence a day, and step by step he won his way up. He was nineteen before he learned his ABC, because education was not free in those days, and it was not till then he was able to pay the school fee of threepence a week out of his wages. When he brought out his invention, he was met by a storm of opposition. Who ever had heard of such an absurd thing? Every one would be killed who risked their lives in a railway train! Yet George Stephenson held on in spite of much opposition, and in the end he got his way. Where should we have been to-day if George Stephenson had given in?

It doesn't seem a very noble thing, just to stick in, and learn a difficult lesson, but it is all the more noble because there is no glory about it—no blare of trumpets or beating of drums. Perhaps nobody will know how hard you have striven; nevertheless you are laying the foundations of a hero, and, who knows, perhaps some day you will take your place among the great ones of the earth.

When Nelson was a boy he once lost heart and very nearly gave in. He had been at sea some time, had gone through many hardships and dangers and had not yet won the rank of a midshipman. Then his health broke down and he was just on the verge of throwing the whole thing up, thinking he would never reach the top of the tree, when suddenly a great thought came to him. His life was not his own. He had a King and a country to serve. For England's sake he would brave every danger, suffer every hardship, overcome every difficulty. From that day he never turned back, and no boy needs to be told what England owes to Nelson.

We all owe a duty to our country. We owe it to do our best in the task appointed to us. Are we going to turn back from it just because it seems humdrum, and tiresome, and not to our taste? The Israelites turned back. They were afraid of the difficulties and the dangers; they forgot that they owed it as a duty to their God, and to their nation, to go forward at that time. And what was the result? Forty barren years of wandering in the desert; the glory which might have been theirs passed on to other men!

But there is another difficulty we have to meet —the difficulty of *Standing up for the Right.*

To stand up for the right? That is what the brave Belgians did. The Germans asked that they might be allowed to walk through Belgium, and in that event none of the inhabitants should be harmed. That would have been the easy way for the Belgians, but did they agree? Rather than sell their honour, rather than go back on their plighted word, they risked their lives, their homes, their dear ones, their beautiful cities!

That is what hundreds of martyrs did when they gave their lives rather than deny their faith.

And that is what boys and girls are called upon to do to-day. Nobody wants you to be prigs, but there are occasions when you have to stand up for the right whatever the consequences may be. It isn't an easy thing. It often means risking one's popularity, but it is the only honourable course. Perhaps it is a case of taking the part of a weaker comrade who is being bullied and laughed at. The Israelites were splendid bullies; they were also splendid cowards. They found it much easier to stone two helpless men than to go and fight the sons of Anak. Perhaps it is just speaking out bravely when something is being done which doesn't meet with your approval, and when your silence means that you approve of and share in it.

Have you heard of Bishop Patteson, the brave missionary to the South Sea Islands, who was killed by the natives? He was a brave, strong man, not afraid to lay down his life, and he grew out of a brave, strong boy.

When he was at school he was captain of his cricket team, and one of the best players in it. One day, after a match, the boys began to make silly jokes, and use bad words. Patteson stood it till he could stand it no longer. Then he rose and said, 'Look here, I'll not share in this kind of talk, and I'll not listen to it. If it goes on, I must leave the room, and resign from the team.' And he did leave the room, and he did resign from the team. It must have cost him a lot, but it cost the other boys a lot too. Patteson was their best player, and you may imagine what it was like to lose him from the team. They gathered round him, and begged him to come back, and promised never again to annoy him with their bad stories. They kept their promise, and Patteson went back, and led the team to victory.

Stick up for the right then, even if you are in the minority. Don't go with the majority if they are wrong.

In the last place, I want you to think what was the difference between the ten spies and the two. What made them act so differently? Was it their upbringing? No; they had all lived the same life of hardship in Egypt. Was it their position? No; they were all 'heads of the Children of Israel,' each man a 'head' in his own tribe. What was it then? Just this: The ten were measuring *themselves* against the giants, but Caleb and Joshua were measuring *God* against the giants.

That is the secret of true victory—the secret of how to be brave. David knew it when he went against Goliath, Gideon knew it when he went forth against the hosts of Midian with his three hundred. The disciples knew it when they set out to conquer the world for Christ.

And we can know it too. Have you heard the story of Stonewall Jackson at the battle of Bull Run? The fight was waging very fierce, shells were exploding and bullets flying in all directions. Jackson had been hit in the head; yet still he remained perfectly cool, and apparently indifferent to danger. Another General asked him the reason, and received the reply: 'General, my religious belief teaches me to feel as safe in battle as in bed. God has fixed the time for my death. I do not concern myself about that, but to be always ready, no matter when it may overtake me.' After a pause he added: 'General, that is the way all men should live, and then all men would be equally brave.'

Whatever be our difficulties, whatever be our dangers, we need never fear them if we can say with Caleb and Joshua—'The Lord is with us.' 'Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.'

In Praise of Faith.

A STUDY OF HEBREWS XI. 1, 6, XII. 1, 2.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

III.

FAITH is a venture; but it is not *a forlorn hope*. It has value, for by it man gains his highest good. Faith has had, and ever has, its verification in religious history and experience. The Christian faith, to which the writer turns in the twelfth chapter, has the verification that the record of the faith of the heroes of faith under the old covenant offers, for 'we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses.' It can find its final and absolute verification in Christ, 'looking unto Jesus the author and the perfecter of faith.' Each man can get a verification of it himself in his Christian character and experience, if by it he is enabled to 'lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset *him*, and run with patience the race that is set before *him*' (He 12^{1-2}). Each of these modes of verification demands our closer scrutiny.

(1) About the cloud of witnesses a twofold assertion is made. In the last verses of the preceding chapter it is asserted that not having found full satisfaction for themselves they await with hope the fulfilment of God's promise in the Christian community. Their good can be completed only by the consummation being wrought out in Christian character and experience. As they apart from us cannot be made perfect, we, in our Christian faith, and what it secures and accomplishes, can minister to their comfort, peace, and joy. In the first verse of this chapter they are represented as by their presence with us, and interest in us, encouraging us in the effort which the Christian life involves, and assuring us that it is not made in vain. How significant and valuable for us who have loved ones in the Unseen both thoughts are!

(i.) They who have lived and loved, suffered and laboured, here on earth for the kingdom of God do not at death snap the thread of continuity between this life and the next. Delivered from sin, sorrow, death, and judgment, they have not yet entered into full possession of their heavenly inheritance, for heaven's completion waits for the fulfilment of God's purpose on earth. It is a

comfort and help for the bereaved to think that their loved ones are waiting hopefully for that glorious and blessed consummation for which they are working in hope. Without attempting to formulate any doctrine of an intermediate state preparatory for the final perfection, glory, and blessedness, we may welcome such a suggestion as the writer here offers as harmonizing the individual and the universal hope, which is rooted in, and springs out of the Christian faith. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth; heaven's joy increases as the kingdom of God spreads and grows on earth.

(ii.) The Christian believer is not in a succession of heroes of faith; he belongs to a company that not only lives eternally in God, but is near to him, and cares for him. They who were actors are now represented as spectators. That is all that the writer's purpose requires him here to state for our comfort and encouragement; but may we not venture a step further than he has done, and suggest that they are not idle spectators, but that in ways too secret for us to detect they are helpers of our faith? Can they whose joy it was to minister to our good, while here on earth, be denied the further joy of continuing that ministry? If apart from us they are not perfected, are we being perfected apart from them? Is not their partnership with us in this life not less, but more real, even in the life beyond? The Church Militant and the Church Triumphant are and cannot but be one.

(2) I have taken for granted that we need not limit the cloud of witnesses to those heroes of faith immediately present to the thought of the writer. Not only the patriarchs, lawgivers, rulers, and prophets under the Old Covenant may be included in this company; but the apostles, the fathers, the saints, the sages, the seers, the martyrs, the reformers of the Christian Church: and not only they whose names are written large in the annals of the Church; but also those whose names are graven on the tablets of our hearts, who, known to and prized by only a few, yet not less faithfully lived, laboured, suffered, and 'fell on sleep' in Christ. When we contemplate these believers of all lands and ages, in their experience and character, their labours and sufferings, sacrifices and services, what a verification of the venture of faith is ours! They all lived and endured as seeing Him who is invisible, as tasting of the powers of the age to come. God and immortality in Christ were their inspiration. They were not dominated by the material, but ruled by the spiritual: they were not engrossed in the present, but were possessed by the future. They were what they were, and did what they did, because the invisible to them was real, and the future certain. Their example should convince us that faith is 'worth while,' that life at its truest and best is possible only as its supreme interest lies beyond earth and time in the Unseen and the Eternal. It is good for us to realize, so far as it is possible for us, 'here in the body pent, absent from home,' the presence of that cloud of witnesses. Without the sensible tokens on which our intercourse on earth depends, may we not believe that there is a reality of the communion of saints; and there may come to us the *uplift* of belonging to such a society?

(3) And yet the writer would not have us fix our attention on them to catch, if we may, some glimpses of their glory, or overhear some snatches of their song. No, it is to Jesus that we are to look, and to Jesus in one particular aspect of His manifold perfection. We are to look to Jesus as *the author and perfecter of faith* (the word *our* inserted by A.V. and R.V. alike hides the true meaning). He is here presented not as the object but as the subject of faith; and we are called here not to believe in Him, but to believe as He did. He is, that goes without saying, the object of Christian faith as Saviour and Lord, for He alone mediates for us the truth and grace of God, and this epistle so presents Him. But what is relevant to the context is the complementary truth that He is the subject of faith. A distinction used to be made between the religion of Jesus and the Christian faith; and defenders of the truth of the latter have often failed to recognize the worth of the former. Jesus mediated the divine truth and grace in His personal relation to God, His dependence on communion with and submission to the Father; in short, through His faith. He received in faith from God what He imparted in grace and truth to men. It was by the exercise of faith that He so anticipated the joy which was set before them, that He was enabled to endure the Cross, despising shame. This enthronement is the victory of faith in God over sin, death, and judgment. He could not be our Saviour and Lord, the object of our faith, had He not as the Son lived by faith in God as His Father. Accordingly, Christ is the supreme example of faith. In Him and Him alone we can

see to what depths faith can reach without failing, and to what heights it can mount without growing faint; what sacrifices it can endure, and what victories it can secure.

(4) Jesus is, however, more than an example: as we look to Him, He surely looks on us, and His look is potent as was His look on Peter. He is not an example of the distant past, but a companion of the immediate present, and a companion endowed with immeasurable transforming influence. 'We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{18}). That He as Spirit can become an inward renewing power is the testimony of Christian experience, and the extent of that influence our thought cannot measure. But, meanwhile, we may limit ourselves to considering the influence of Christ as psychologically explicable. Concentration of the attention on, absorption of the interest in, an object has a reflex influence on the personality in reproducing the characteristics of that object. We become good or bad as we fix our minds on good or bad sights, sounds, persons. Accordingly, the contemplation of Christ will, apart altogether from the conscious, voluntary activity He may put forth on our behalf, produce resemblance to Christ. The aspect of His mainfold perfection on which we fix our gaze will be the aspect which will be reproduced in us. If we contemplate His faith in temptation, trial, sorrow, suffering, and death, our faith will develop, and in this respect we shall be like Him. For this reason a knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus, if joined to an insight into its inner meaning, may be made a very constant and potent means of grace. As we companion with Him in the Wilderness of Temptation, the Mount of Transfiguration, the Garden of Agony, and the Cross of Desolation, we shall be enabled to live through all experiences as He did by faith in God.

(5) With the inspiration of the cloud of witnesses and of Jesus Himself, we may put our faith to the test and find the verification of our venture.

(i.) 'The race that is set before us' is the vocation in life which has come from God to us; it is the assigned task. In accordance with the whole context we may affirm that this vocation will possess two characteristics, which may be expressed in the language of the preceding chapter. We shall look for 'the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God.' It is a spiritual and not a material good which will be sought. Again, we shall desire 'a better country, that is an heavenly.' The spiritual is also a future good. Paul has the same thought. 'We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal' (2 Co 4^{18}). It is truth, love, holiness, blessedness, the Christlike (which is also the Godlike, for He is the image of the invisible God) that is sought. The vocation has the marks of faith, for here the invisible rules as the real, and the future as the certain.

(ii.) There are two hindrances to the fulfilment of the vocation, and consistently with his figure of the vocation as a race to be run, the writer describes these hindrances as a burden, and a clinging garment (this is the figure suggested by εὐπερίστατον, no less than by ἀποθέμενοι). In the burden are included even the innocent things, the pleasures and the profits of this earthly life which divide the affections, and distract the efforts, and so prevent the concentration of interest and purpose which the spiritual, future good demands, if it is to be constantly pursued, and finally secured. Faith which prefers the higher good will make possible all the self-denial in respect of any lower goods which may be needful. Had the rich young ruler had faith enough in the eternal life about which he questioned Jesus, he would have sold all he had, and given to the poor, that he might follow Him.

(iii.) The clinging garment impeding the racer's steps is sin. 'The article τήν does not point to some particular sin, but to that which characterizes all sin, the tenacity with which it clings to a man' (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*, iv. p. 365). Faith gives deliverance from sin, for it brings another interest, affection, purpose into the life. It is our interest that directs our attention, and our attention that determines our action. 'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat' (Gn 3^{6}). Thought dwells on the object until the will is moved. The faith for which the invisible is real, and the future certain, will not allow the soul to be attracted to and dominated by the sensuous, temporal good that sin offers. Persistent as temptation may be, yet the constancy of faith can

prevail against it. What faith possesses in Christ so attracts and dominates the soul as to exclude all other interests. The writer represents the laying aside of the burden and the clinging robe as preparatory to the race as a task to be undertaken; but here both his imagery and his psychology are defective. It is the faith which is the characteristic feature of the Christian vocation that delivers the soul both from the burden and the clinging garment, by the process, just sketched, of the mutual exclusiveness of rival and competing interests. When heaven reigns, earth resigns its sway; when grace rules, sin ceases to be.

(iv.) The word 'patience' does not at all adequately express *ὑπομονή*. It means endurance, steadfastness, constancy. The course is kept in spite of all hindrances and difficulties. No effort is too severe, and no sacrifice is too great, if fidelity to the call demand it. Such endurance again is the fruit of faith. To illustrate by Paul's words, 'Our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory' (2 Co 4^{17}). For faith, God is so real, and immortality so certain, that the sorrows and struggles of this earthly life, which is swiftly passing away, appear so insignificant that they cannot divert interest and effort away from the vocation, which has its beginning in God, and its end in immortality. Thus, alike by what he can surrender, and by what he can achieve in his Christian life, can a man find for himself and offer to others the verification of his faith.

Contributions and Comments.

Σκάνδαλον.

The problem of this word has been discussed this month at the seminar which meets in connexion with the Hellenistic Department at Manchester University. This note is meant to prepare in advance for the excursus written by Archdeacon Willoughby Allen for his forthcoming book on the Gospel of Mark, in which he works out the tentative suggestion made at the seminar, and establishes it firmly, as it seems to me, on the basis of O.T. evidence. Dr. W. H. Bennett independently examined the O.T. evidence and came practically to the same conclusion.

I confine myself mainly to the Greek record. *Σκάνδαλον* is a word which Grimm describes as 'purely biblical and ecclesiastical,' for the Attic word denoting the stick of a mouse-trap. This occurs once only, in Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 687, *σκανδάληθρ' ἱστὰς ἐπῶν*, 'setting word-traps.' Pollux, the antiquary of ii A.D., interprets Aristophanes for us, and we have also scholia pointing the same way. Etymologically the meaning is guaranteed by the certain connexion with Skr. *skand*, 'leap, spirt,' Lat. *scando*, O. Ir. *scendim*, 'I spring': 'sudden motion' is the differentia of the root. It can hardly be doubted that *σκάνδαλον* existed before *σκανδάληθρον*, though not occurring in literature; we can see no other possible step between the root *σκανδ* and the Aristophanic derivative. (Contrast the history of *ἀγάπη* as a shortening of *ἀγάπησις*, which I illustrated in The Expository Times for December 1914.)

Now in eight of its LXX appearances *σκάνδαλον* renders מוֹקֵשׁ, a 'noose' or 'snare.' It is in company with *παγίς*, as in Jos 23^{13}; and that it means something of the same kind is presumable, unless there is a mistranslation of the Hebrew. The only reason for suspecting this, or giving *σκάνδαλον* a double meaning, is the fact that in Lv 19^{14} and two other places it renders מִכְשׁוֹל, a 'stumbling-block,' as also in Aquila's version of Is 8^{14}; cf. the two N.T. citations of this passage. Since our purely Greek evidence is all for 'trap,' and a Hebrew word with this meaning accounts for the largest number of LXX occurrences of the noun, the question struck me whether *snare* might not be at least the normal meaning in N.T. A link between *snare* and *rock* might be imagined if we apply the principle of the modern mouse-trap on an enlarged scale: a carcase is placed in a large hole, a rock delicately poised just over it and kept from falling by a stick—the wild beast knocks the stick aside and brings the rock down on him. I suggested that in Lk 20^{18} the rock acts first as a *πρόσκομμα*, and then as a *σκάνδαλον*; cf. the combination in Ro 9^{33}, 1 P 2^{8}.

If *σκάνδαλον* ever does mean *stumbling-block*, it

will be through the influence of what we may most probably call a mistranslation of מִכְשׁוֹל: it will be a real 'Biblical' sense, as due to a mistake which gained currency through appearing in the Bible—like our proverbial 'strain *at* a gnat,' which started from a misprint in the A.V. At a later time the N.T. use of the word gave birth to a new meaning in M. Gr. as in English *scandal* (cf. Thumb, *Hellenismus*, 123). But if we start from *snare* as the noun, we shall be surprised to find in how large a proportion of instances the sense of the passage will be improved, or at the least not damaged, by this rendering for both noun and verb. 'The *snare* of the cross' is perhaps the least obvious. But suppose we substitute מוֹקֵשׁ for מִכְשׁוֹל in Delitzsch's translation of 1 Co 1^{23}, would not the figure be quite rational? The Jew with his obstinate prejudice against the doctrine of a suffering Messiah thrusts his head into a noose, and unless he ceases to resist it will throttle him. So in Gal 5^{11}, the offensive doctrine must surely have 'ceased to work' as a 'snare,' if its great preacher is conceding the one thing about which Jews cared most; he may well ask why they go on persecuting him! I must not follow this up for other instances of *σκάνδαλον* and *σκανδαλίζομαι*, on which Archdeacon Allen's investigation will shed great light. But I should like to prepare the way for the discussion of it, and advance some considerations which lie outside the range of his excursus.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

Genesis xli. 40.

THE R.V. renders as follows, 'Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou.' The fault of this rendering is that the R.V., as is usually the case, ignores the emphasis of the Hebrew. If we were to retranslate the R.V., we should begin with *tih'ye* or *V'hāyītha*, but not with *atta tih'ye*, as the Hebrew does. This can only mean, '*It is thou that shalt be.* . . .' And in this case the contrast is not between *atta* and *ani*, but between *atta* and *hak-kissē'*. Now if the contrast were between *atta* and *ani*, the personal pronoun would be as necessary before *'egdal* as before *tih'ye*; moreover, a different order would be required. I believe that אֶגְדַּל is not the 1st sing. impfct. Qal, but the elative form of the adjective, and that the sentence should be translated, 'only the throne will be too great for thee.'

The elative form, *Eqṭal* or *Aqṭal* is well known in Arabic. It is the equivalent of the comparative and superlative forms. Although obsolete in Hebrew, it is still recognized in such forms as אֵיתָן, אַכְזָב, אַכְזָר, and אַרְבֶּה. In the present instance, the form *Eqṭāl* is nearer the original than the more usual *Eqṭāl*.

HERBERT LOEWE.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Judges xv. 8.

OF the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society* a mention was made in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (February, 1915), p. 195, where it was suggested that a new theory has been put forward about the Hebrew sentence of Jg 15^{8}: ויך אותם שוק על ירך מכה גדולה. Mr. M. A. Canney says that this sentence is not accurately translated by the commentators. The R.V. has, 'And he smote them hip and thigh with a great slaughter.' We agree with Mr. Canney if he means by his 'inaccuracy of translation' that the word 'slaughter' used in the English Version is misleading, because a Semitic scholar is not immediately invited by the context to consider it as a simple noun of action of the verb 'he smote.' On the other hand, I cannot see any great possibility in the following statement: 'But the purpose of this note is to urge that probably all attempts to take *shōḳ* in the ordinary way are mistaken, and that in this passage the form may be not nominal but verbal. It may be the infinitive absolute of a verb *shūḳ*. Hebrew *shūḳ* would be equivalent to Arabic *sāḳa*' (pp. 87–88 of the above mentioned *Journal*).

The word מכה which comes immediately after the curious English expression 'hip and thigh,' and which is a noun of action to the verb 'he smote,' would not suffer the probability of the existence of a second verb between them; the construction is in harmony with the genius of the Semitic languages, and we cannot deviate from it without strong philological evidence. Further, it is not elegant in the Semitic languages to move the not reduplicated 'weak letters,' in the verbs called *concave*, by heterogeneous vowels. In the

Arabic language which is claimed to support Mr. Canney's view, the letter *Waw*, when forming the second radical of a verb, is changed, in the present participle, into a *Hamza* written in form of *Yâ'*. In Aramæo-Syriac,[1] it is changed also into a *Hamza-Alaph* or a *Yodh*. This principle is generally maintained in Hebrew where the *Waw* is simply eliminated. Why should we change it in this instance? and how can we translate *striking*? Finally, in the case of an infinitive absolute, a suffix-pronoun ought to link it with the first objective particle; and we have not in the sentence such a pronoun; and we cannot add it without modifying the whole construction.

We are not justified, therefore, in forging a new Hebrew and Aramaic verb to corroborate an attempt at interpretation which leaves the reason of the real meaning of the Semitic trope as problematic as it was before.

We welcome the new publication of the Young Oriental Society of Manchester, and we notice with great pleasure the note of originality which characterizes it. We hope soon to see its honourable members vying zealously with the greatest similar societies in Europe. In this they will be greatly helped by the John Rylands Library, which affords all desirable material in this branch of science.

A. MINGANA.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

The Use of Enoch in St. Luke xvi. 19–31.

SOME interesting points are raised by the use of ᾅδης in Lk 16^{23}. The word is not very common in the New Testament, occurring only ten times. The fact of its occurrence at all is, however, interesting, in view of the curious absence of the term from the papyri (cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocab. of Gk. Test.*, *sub voc.*). It had apparently fallen out of use in the κοινή, if indeed it was ever more than a literary and rather poetical word.[2] In the LXX, however, it is the almost invariable equivalent of She'ol, and in the great majority of the cases where it occurs in the pre-Christian Greek Apocalypses and Apocrypha this usage is continued (cf. 2 Mac 6^{23}, 3 Mac 4^{8} $5^{42.\,51}$ 6^{31}, Sir $17^{19ff.}$ 21^{10}, Wis 2^{1} 16^{13}, Sib. Or 1^{22} 5^{178}, *Test. XII. Patr.* Reub 4^{6}, Levi 4^{1}, Benj 9^{5}). It is thus natural to suspect that the New Testament use of ᾅδης will follow the Old Testament use of She'ol. As a matter of fact this is only true in five out of the ten passages where the word occurs (Mt 11^{23} 16^{18}, Lk 10^{15}, Ac $2^{27.\,31}$), and these all depend directly upon the Old Testament. Four of the remaining passages are in Revelation (1^{18} 6^{8} $20^{13.\,14}$), and here, strangely enough, the usage much more strongly resembles the semi-personified classical use of the term. There are, however, a few precedents for this, *e.g.* Sib. Or $3^{393.\,458}$ and especially 4 Es 8^{53}, where 'infernum' probably stands for an original ᾅδης; cf. also Wis $1^{14\text{-}16}$ 17^{14}.

There remains the use of ᾅδης in Lk $16^{19\text{-}31}$, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Here we are faced with the initial difficulty that it appears to be a place of torment, where the rich man is ἐν βασάνοις. A further problem arises in connexion with 'Abraham's bosom,' a phrase for which no very good parallel has been cited, and which leaves us in doubt whether we are to regard Lazarus also as being in Hades.

The use of ᾅδης in this penal sense has practically no strict parallel. It is utterly unlike the rather classical usage of Revelation, and Ps. Sol 14^{6} ('Hades and darkness and destruction'), cf. 15^{11}, bears it little resemblance. She'ol, however, is used in a penal sense in En 63^{10} 99^{11}, and this suggests that the use of ᾅδης in Lk 16^{23} may perhaps be due to the influence of this ubiquitous book.

This, however, is a slight matter in itself. The search for further parallels to this parable in the Book of Enoch shows that however the actual use of the word ᾅδης may be derived, a much more important influence has been exerted by the ideas and even by the language of ch. 16 ff. and especially of ch. 22. This contains the account of the strange mountain in the West, where the dead await the judgment. 'And there were four hollow places therein, deep and very smooth, three of them dark and one bright, with a spring of water in its midst. . . .' (Enoch then hears the voice of Abel calling for vengeance until the seed of Cain is exterminated from the earth.) . . . 'Then I

[1] For the Aramaic language which has in this point special morphological features, see our Syriac grammar, *Clef de la langue Araméenne*, Nos. 152–156, with the footnote, and No. 219 sqq.

[2] Its use on tombstones in Asia Minor (*vide* Moulton and Milligan, *loc. cit.*) suggests that it had remained in common use in formal religious phraseology, a fact which might account for its adoption as the LXX equivalent of She'ol.

asked about the hollows (reading κοιλωμάτων), διὰ τί ἐχωρίσθησαν ἓν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνός; And he answered me saying, These four (three?) were made χωρίζεσθαι τὰ πνεύματα τῶν νεκρῶν. This one was divided off for the souls of the just, wherein is the bright spring of water. And this one was made for sinners ὅταν ἀποθάνωσιν καὶ ταφῶσιν εἰς τὴν γὴν and judgment has not been done on them ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν. Here are separated their souls εἰς τὴν μεγάλην βάσανον ταύτην, until the great day of judgment, of scourges and tortures of the accursed for ever ἵν' ἀνταπόδοσις τῶν πνευμάτων' (so Dr. Charles. Reading *ad fin.* corrupt).

It seems very probable that the parable Lk 16^{19-31} contains reminiscences of this passage (and its context) both in idea and in language.

(1) 'Abraham's bosom' suggests the first of the four compartments, bright, and with the spring of water from which Dives craved a drop. The parallel would be the more striking if it were clear that this division was for the righteous unjustly slain, but the case of Abel comes in quite disconnectedly in Enoch. In Enoch, however, the emphasis on the water is marked. The water is perhaps meant to be magical 'water of life' (mentioned in En 16^{4}), and if so the strange καταψύξῃ of Lk 16^{24}, which suggests the complete quenching of the rich man's thirst, is explained.[1]

(2) The Enoch passage lays great stress upon the separation of the souls in the different divisions. This is obviously parallel to the χάσμα μέγα of Lk 16^{26}; and this phrase, unique in the New Testament, actually occurs in the context in Enoch (18^{11}, where indeed there is a further parallel since Enoch speaks of looking ἐπέκεινα τοῦ χάσματος to a τόπος ἔρημος καὶ φοβερός). And is there an echo of the στήριγμα of En 18^{5} in the curious ἐστήρικται of Lk 16^{26}?

(3) The second of the four divisions in En 22 seems exactly made for the case of the rich man. It is assigned to those who die and are buried, a curiously close parallel with the ἀπέθανε . . . καὶ ἐτάφη of Lk 16^{22}, where the mention of burial is not otherwise easy to explain. Judgment has not been done upon them ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν, a phrase recalled in Lk 16^{25} ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου. This parallel is very striking, since the use of ζωή in this sense of 'life-time' is almost if not quite unique in the New Testament. 1 Co 15^{19} and, less clearly, 1 Ti 4^{8}, are the only passages which show any resemblance to this usage. Again, only in this division in Enoch are the spirits ἐν βασάνοις. βάσανος, used of future torment, occurs only in this parable in the New Testament, Lk $16^{23.28}$. It occurs once in another sense in Mt 4^{24}. The definite τῆς βασάνου in Lk 16^{28} perhaps suggests the influence of some well-known account of the next world.

(4) The final ἀνταπόδοσις τῶν πνευμάτων suggests the very moral of the parable.

It seem difficult to believe that these are all accidental coincidences, especially in the case of the words χάσμα, ζωή, and βάσανος. But if not we must conclude that the whole parable is based on Enoch, and, in particular, the problem whether Lazarus was also ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ has found its solution.

L. W. Grensted.

Egerton Hall, Manchester.

[1] I owe this suggestion to Dr. W. H. Bennett.

Reminiscence of Rabbi Duncan.

In The Expository Times for November 1914, the 'Great Text' is Ro 5^{20}, and the translation of the Revised Version is used—'And the law came in beside, that the trespass might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly.' Whenever that text comes before me, I always remember a translation which the late Rabbi Duncan gave us, namely, 'And the law came in *by the by*.' He was speaking of The Entrance of Sin and Death, The Entrance of the Law, and The Entrance of Righteousness and Life. Sin entered (εἰσῆλθε), and Law came in by the by (παρεισῆλθε). A few words of comment showed the appropriateness and the force of this translation. This remembered translation recalled a few other sayings of the Rabbi which may even at this date interest some readers.

Dr. Duncan died in February 1870, and he was only ten or twelve times with the Senior Hebrew Class during that session in which he died. One had often heard of his eccentric ways, and how he sometimes forgot himself in the opening prayer; occasionally, to the delight of some at any rate, occupying thus a good part of the hour. He had great facility also in using Latin synonyms to bring out the exact shade of meaning he wished to convey. On one occasion he began the opening prayer with the class in these words, 'O Lord, thou art worthy to be feared—Venerandus.' He had great delight in expounding the Psalms; and

his remarks were often very helpful, and illuminating. For instance, in Ps 1^2, we have the statement, 'and in his law doth he meditate day and night.' On this he remarked to this effect:—To meditate is to mutter. In the East when men meditate they mutter. A Jew always when he meditates mutters. Silent meditation is owing to our Occidental civilization. And to make perfectly clear what he meant he sat down in his chair, and leaning back muttered away to himself, audibly but indistinctly. Thus he pictured a meditating Jew.

He liked to speak of the JEHOVAHISM of the Psalms. He gave the subject of the first Psalm as Jehovah's Man; of the second as Jehovah's Messiah; and of the third as Jehovah's Salvation. He described this Liturgical Book of Psalms as related to the Torah and Nabiim (the Law and the Prophets), as the responses of the congregation of Israel to the voice of God, speaking to them in the Torah, and in his peculiar providence as explicated by the Torah and the Prophets. Among pious Israelites was a deep sensibility to the light of Jehovah's countenance. 'When he shone upon them, they raised jubilant hallelujahs; when he hid his face they were troubled. On his excellencies they dwelt with rapture, on his mighty works for Israel with warmest gratitude.'

I am afraid the learned Rabbi had no great regard for the extreme Higher Criticism, which he perhaps considered to be 'made in Germany.' Once at least he sarcastically represented some of the extremists as saying, 'They didn't know everything down in Judee.' He was greatly attached to his students, and they to him. He would gladly tell when he went home, 'My laddies gave me a cheer to-day.' When he spake to themselves in the class, he addressed them as 'Dear young Gentlemen.' And it was fine to hear him speak of his colleague in the chair, Dr. Davidson, as 'My Beloved Colleague.' All our recollections of Rabbi Duncan make us think of the great man and profound thinker and spiritual genius as like a little child in the kingdom of heaven.

Edinburgh. JAMES MATTHEW.

Entre Nous.

A Chinese Hastings.

This is the title of a pamphlet which has been sent by Dr. Timothy Richard of the Chinese Literature Society, Shanghai. This is the pamphlet—

'When Dr. Hastings' Five-volume *Dictionary of the Bible* began to appear in 1900, it was at once perceived that it marked a great advance on its predecessors, and many a missionary longed to see such parts of his work as were suitable for the use of our Chinese fellow-labourers turned into Chinese and placed at their disposal. Of course the books contained a vast deal which would be wholly indigestible to the Chinese, even if all were agreed that many of the new theories would find a congenial atmosphere here. At the same time one longed to see the undoubted wheat which laded the pages of Hastings prepared for Chinese consumption. Accordingly a few trial articles were translated and appeared in our Society's Church paper, "The Missionary Review." But those were pre-Revolution days, and nothing further was done at the time. Meantime reform was making steady headway, and the Chinese Church was constantly increasing in quantity and quality. It looked to us to give them the best we knew. Then came the revolution. The Church advanced by leaps and bounds. Chinese leadership became more prominent than ever. The needs of the preachers immersed in a new atmosphere became more clamant. They demanded our best. They now see that much that formerly used to be done for them they ought to do for themselves. But our knowledge and experience of Christian Truth is acknowledged to be deeper and riper than theirs, and the work of giving them a new Bible Dictionary is something that we can and ought to do.

'Then in 1906 appeared the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* which is the very department most necessary for the Chinese Church. After that came the opening volumes of the great *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and finally in 1909 the one-volume Dictionary. All of these furnished us with an embarrassment of riches. The time seemed ripe to attempt to give the Chinese Church a really helpful Dictionary, and this was the unanimous view of the various Conferences held recently under the Presidency of Dr. Mott. By general consent the C. L. S. was looked

to as the likeliest agency to produce the book, and our interest in the project became intensified when we discovered that India had stolen a march on us and had already a Tamil Hastings' Dictionary.

'Of course the Home Dictionaries were prepared for the ministers of the Home Churches, and some of the articles are meant for highly educated men. As has been truly said, the writers of the articles in Hastings did not write for the Chinese Church. Our work will, therefore, differ very materially from theirs inasmuch as our writers will always keep in mind the average Chinese Christian, and especially the average helper or pastor. The standard of education among them is as yet not very high, and we will always be in danger of giving them stones instead of bread. Still, the attempt is to be made to supply a Dictionary in which the general point of view is modern, and yet is sufficiently easy Chinese to be understood of those upon whom the great burden of evangelizing their country will more and more be thrust.

'It will thus be seen that our general object is not the dissemination of the latest continental theories, but a practical help to the Chinese workers. As the "Suggestions for the Guidance of Translators" states, "The general object of the work is to provide the Chinese pastor and leader with the best aids known to devout scholarship for the reverent understanding of the Sacred Scriptures. The chief aim is practical, and the emphasis will therefore be on the New Testament. In the carrying out of this object much consecrated common sense and hard work will be necessary, but we owe it to the Church to make the attempt."

'The problem before us now is how to secure this general object. The most of the work will be done by the staff of the C. L. S. It will, in fact, be a C. L. S. Hastings, but a goodly number of co-labourers have already promised their assistance for various articles. A common basis and method of procedure in the work has been agreed on, so that it is hoped that the work may be portioned out to the translators at the beginning of the coming autumn. If our plans are successfully carried out, the resultant Dictionary ought to be richer and more serviceable to the Chinese than a literal translation of any one original. In this connection it should be added that a considerable number of special articles, not found in any foreign Bible Dictionary, will be prepared with Chinese readers especially in view.

'As many of the pastors are poorly paid, it is highly desirable that the Society be enabled to issue the work at an exceedingly moderate price. The probable cost of an edition of 3000 copies, with stereos, maps, and plates will be £600. A gift of £200 in memoriam has already been given us for the purpose of helping the publication of the Dictionary. This very early and timely gift we take as a sign of God's blessing on the undertaking, so we thank God and take courage.

'The work of the editors and translators will be difficult and delicate. Many problems will need divine wisdom for the right solution. Let me therefore ask our readers to remember these workers in prayer, so that this great undertaking may be crowned with the divine blessing. It may possibly be the greatest single contribution to the Church of China which this Society has ever been privileged to make.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. John T. Montgomery, Quigley's Point, Co. Donegal.

Illustrations for the Great Text for May must be received by the 20th of March. The text is Ph 2^{5-8}.

The Great Text for June is Ph 2^{9-11}—'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' A copy of Rutherford's *The Seer's House*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

One of the 'Papers for War Time,' issued from the Oxford University Press, has been written by Professor A. G. Hogg. In that paper, under the title of *Christianity and Force*, Mr. Hogg deals with the teaching of our Lord on the right way to treat evil-doers. Many papers have been published on that subject since the war began, but Mr. Hogg is worth reading after them all.

He begins by making it quite clear that he is not going to set Christ's teaching about non-resistance aside as 'an inconvenient mystery.' On the contrary, he holds it to be 'one of the luminous centres of all our thought about the meaning of the Christian Gospel.' And then he relieves alarm by adding that, when it is understood, we shall feel it our duty to support our country wholeheartedly in the present struggle, 'though we shall hate war, and a good many other things, with a more perfect hatred than ever we felt before.'

Why is it that so many Christian people explain away, if they do not openly reject, Christ's teaching on turning the other cheek? Professor Hogg says it is due to two quite healthy instincts. The first instinct calls it sentimental weakness to single out physical violence as a specially hateful thing. The other instinct encourages a man—any man of healthy moral nature—to fight to the death against every form of evil.

But, in response to the first instinct, Christ does not confine His prohibition to the resistance of physical evil. He forbids meeting violence with violence, but He also and equally forbids meeting litigation with litigation, and oppression by government with passive resistance. The words are: 'Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall impress thee to go one mile, go with him twain' (Mt 5^{39-41}). So the real issue is not whether violence should be met by force, but whether force should be used in any manner whatever.

The second instinct—the instinct to fight against evil in any form—Christ not only does not discourage, He encourages it beyond all the teachers that were before Him. The difference is that, while they dealt with the act, He deals with the will. Do *not* resist the evil act, He says. But why? In order that you may effectively resist, and conquer and kill, the evil will.

There is no way of conquering the evil will, and making it a good will, but by not resisting the evil act. Or rather, by meeting the evil act with a good act. For the moment that we speak of not resisting, we remember that Christ's precepts are never negative but always positive. This also was

a difference, and a marvellous great one, between Him and the teachers who went before Him. 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink.' When, therefore, we speak of Christ's doctrine of *non-resistance*, we are keeping out of sight that which seems at first to make the teaching more difficult, but in the end gives it all its ease and victory.

Thus it comes to pass that for Professor Hogg the whole problem is a question of justice. There is a lower justice and there is a higher. The lower justice says, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' And to Professor Hogg it is quite plain that when the higher justice cannot be reached the lower must assert itself. It cannot be reached by any of the nations of Europe at the present time. They are not Christian enough. Even this country is not Christian enough. Therefore if any man should deny the application of the lower justice to this war, he is not ascending to the higher; he is doing great and far-reaching injustice. But let every man who has had a vision of a justice that is higher than 'an eye for an eye,' do what in him lies to enable this whole nation, and all the nations of the earth, to enjoy that vision. Then (and only then) will it come to pass that they shall learn war no more.

The discovery of the Fatherhood of God is the great theological achievement of the nineteenth century. Where was it found? It was found in the teaching of Jesus.

But when we study the teaching of Jesus, when we study it as carefully as the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, Warden of Radley, has studied it, we do not find that the Fatherhood of God has a prominent place in it. We do not find that it has any deliberate place at all. What we find is that Jesus took God's Fatherhood for granted. We do not find that He laid Himself out to teach it.

How could He? Mr. Selwyn, in his book on *The Teaching of Christ* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), shows very clearly that in the lifetime of our Lord on earth the Fatherhood of God was an accepted doctrine in Judaism. No doubt to the Israelites of the Old Testament the Fatherhood was a national rather than an individual fact. But the belief in God as Father of each individual Israelite comes to full expression in the sayings of the Jewish rabbis. 'Be bold as a leopard,' says one rabbi, 'be bold as a leopard, and swift as an eagle, and fleet as a hart, and strong as a lion, to do the will of thy Father which is in heaven.'

Jesus does not teach it as if it were a novelty. It was no novelty. He does not directly teach it at all, but takes it for granted. And yet, it is just in taking it for granted that all the significance of His use of it lies, and all the originality. For He never takes for granted that God is the Father of all men. He takes for granted that God is the Father of those who have accepted Him as Saviour.

There is one exception. It is found in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. But because it is in a parable it is an exception, Mr. Selwyn says, that cannot be pressed. Accordingly, he lays down the rule that the teaching of Jesus on the Fatherhood of God is given to those who have already responded to His preaching.

Even to them He does not teach the Fatherhood of God directly. He assumes that they do not need such teaching. 'The distinctive factor in Christianity,' says Dr. Moffatt, whom Mr. Selwyn quotes approvingly, 'is not that Christ taught that God was the Father of men, but that God was *His* Father.' And even this He taught rather by example than by precept. He lived within the Fatherhood of God. All His acts were directed by that consciousness. And thus it was, and not by direct instruction, that the disciples learned to think of God as *their* Father.

Now this is rather disconcerting to the soft

theology and the sentimental preaching which have been so popular in our day. Jesus shows that the universal Fatherhood of God is of no value to the man who does not make God *his* Father. And the only way to make God his Father is to take Jesus Christ as his Saviour. It is of less than no value. For it gives the impression that there is something comfortable and safe in the universal Fatherhood when there is not, just as the Jews thought there was something safe in their having Abraham to their father though the axe was already lying at the root of the tree.

There is a fine example in the Fourth Gospel. In the eighth chapter, in His controversy with the leaders of the Jews, Jesus denies their right to speak of God as their Father. For, he says, 'if God were your Father, ye would love me: for I came forth and am come from God.' Mr. SELWYN admits that the passage may be coloured by the Jewish controversy in which the Evangelist was engaged when the Fourth Gospel was written. But the Gospel was written by one who was deeply imbued with the Master's spirit, and was expressing the spirit of the Church. Jesus shows the Jews how useless it is to rest upon the universal Fatherhood. More than that, He denies them the right. And such a passage, says Mr. SELWYN, could never have been written if Jesus had taught that God's Fatherhood was a truth independent of the believer's relation to Himself.

A great scholar and textual critic, Mr. E. S. BUCHANAN, issuing his translation of an Irish manuscript of the Gospels, which often differs in its readings from the text with which we are familiar, is driven to the conclusion that we have no infallible Bible to lean upon. He had already come to the conclusion that we have no infallible Church. What have we then? We have, he says, 'an infallible and perfect Christ, the Saviour and Hope of the World.'

We have 'an infallible and perfect Christ.' Have we? While Mr. BUCHANAN is writing the words, Professor KIRSOPP LAKE is sending to press his volume of lectures on *The Stewardship of Faith* (Christophers; 5s. net). 'If we go back a little,' says Professor LAKE, 'we find that men believed in an infallible Bible, and that belief has been forced from us by the undeniable proof of fallibility. The same may be said of the belief in an infallible Church. But Liberal Protestantism in the nineteenth century thought that historical criticism would remove all the misrepresentations of later tradition and reveal the figure of the historic Jesus as infallible. Is that hope also to go? Yes, I fear so.'

He does not 'fear' it. His 'Yes, I fear so,' is merely a phrase of conventionality. For on the very next page he tells us that we do not need an infallible Christ. He tells us that we are better without Him. What we need is communion with God.

Now no one will deny that what we need is communion with God. But the question is how we are to obtain it. And when we see the answer which Professor LAKE gives to that question we understand what it means to us when he denies the infallibility of Jesus. He says that we obtain communion with God 'by the striving of the Spirit in personal religion.' It is a well-chosen expression. 'The striving of the Spirit' has a fine Pauline flavour about it. But there is a difference between St. Paul's meaning when he speaks of the striving of the Spirit and Professor LAKE's. There is the difference between Christianity and Judaism. Professor LAKE does not mean the striving of the Spirit at all. He means the striving of our own spirit. The capital letter is a misprint. In the next sentence he calls it plainly 'personal effort.' He says that what we need is 'a living religion of communion with God, without the intervention of any other guide claiming to be an infallible substitute for personal effort.'

Why does Professor LAKE say that Christ is not

infallible? Simply and solely because He expected that the end of the world was at hand. Let us see then what that means.

No writer on the Gospels can at present disregard the eschatological element in them. If he disregards it, he is set down as almost ten years behind the time. Professor KIRSOPP LAKE is not behind the time. He makes much of the eschatological element in the Gospels. He makes so much of it that it is simply on account of that element in the teaching of Jesus that he says: 'We are driven back to a living religion of communion with God, without the intervention of any other guide claiming to be an infallible substitute for personal effort.'

In order to tell us what is meant by the eschatology in the Gospels, Professor LAKE carries us all the way back to the Babylonians. He bids us find a Babylonian statesman of the heyday of Babylonian supremacy, and ask him what progress the empire is making, and what policy her statesmen are pursuing. His answer is that the empire is doing well. Uncivilized tribes are being continually brought within it and offered the blessings of civilization, which is good for them and for the world. And the policy that is adopted is to break up a smaller nation and transplant it into other parts of the empire.

Were the Babylonians justified in doing that? They were altogether justified, says Professor LAKE. It is true that the prophets of Israel were of another mind—but we shall look at that in a moment. Professor LAKE says that in transplanting a nation the Babylonians were doing the work of the world. It is the policy of one of the great nations at the present time. 'With one important exception,' the United States of America are doing now just what the Babylonian empire did so long ago—the exception being that the transplantation is not effected against the will of the small nations, but at their own desire.

Now pass to the Roman Empire, and ask a Roman official how the Empire is doing and what policy is being pursued. It is doing well, he answers. The whole inhabited world seems likely to be incorporated in it. But he says that the policy of the Romans is quite different from that of the Babylonians. They do not transplant the conquered nations. They leave them in their own land, offering them the advantages of Roman citizenship, and teaching them to look up to Rome with respect and obedience.

And again Professor LAKE says that the Roman official is right. He is carrying on the work of civilization. It is precisely the policy that is pursued by another of the great nations at the present time. When the British empire annexed the Transvaal, civil rights were at once conferred upon the Boers, and they learned, not without pride, to speak of themselves as a portion of a great empire and to be ready to lay down their lives for it. 'The British empire is the natural inheritor of the Roman experiment, because it is trying to do what the Romans did—to develop an organization in which it is possible for various nations to preserve their identity, and yet to feel that there is a higher unity of Empire above them.'

Now this is all very well for the great empires. But what did the little nations say? How did the Israelites look upon the Babylonian policy of transplantation? Oh, how they hated it! We have no sooner asked the question than there rings in our ears the bitter cry of the captive son of Jacob away there in the low-lying lands of the Euphrates, when his captors asked him for a song, and said, Sing us one of the songs of Zion: 'How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.'

The whole world went wrong with the Israelites when they were carried captive. Disaster had succeeded disaster before. But this was the crowning catastrophe. What was the result of their bitter

experience? Out of their experience they developed a new conception of the course of history. They came to look upon it as a succession of dramatic catastrophes. And this series of catastrophes was to end in one great catastrophe. For though they suffered, yet they were never overwhelmed by their sufferings. On the contrary, the hope that never died within them led them to look forward to one grand final cataclysm which was to overtake the world, after which the tyranny of the nations would be trodden under foot. Then the children of Israel, as the chosen of God, would recover their independence. They would live under God's direct governance with His anointed King as His representative on earth.

Of this catastrophic view of the universe Professor LAKE offers an example from the Apocalypse of Baruch:

Before therefore judgement exact its own,
And truth demand that which is due,
Let us prepare our soul,
That we may have hope, and be not put to shame,
That we may rest with our Fathers, and be not punished with our foes.
For the youth of the world is past, and the strength of creation is exhausted,
And the coming of the time is at hand,
And the ship is nigh unto the harbour, and the pilgrim reaches the city,
And life is close unto its end.
So then prepare your souls, that,
When you rise up, and leave the ship of your pilgrimage,
You may rest, and pass not into condemnation.

Well, this was the expectation of the pious Israelite when Christ was born. This was the atmosphere that He was born to breathe. Was He content to breathe it? Professor KIRSOPP LAKE says He was content. As soon as He began to preach, He preached the coming of the Kingdom. And the Kingdom was to come with catastrophe.

It is true that He soon found Himself out of touch with the leaders of religion in Israel. But the cause of discord was not that He differed from them as to the catastrophic nature of the future. He differed only as to the best way of bringing the catastrophe about.

There were two ways. The Scribes said that the best way is to keep the Law. You are hindering the coming of the Kingdom by your transgressions, they said. The Kingdom will come when the whole Law is observed down to the last letter.

Jesus also said, Keep the Law. When they came to Him with the question, What must I do that I may have eternal life? His answer was, Keep the commandments. No doubt He made them feel that the keeping of the commandments was beyond them, and invited them to ask, What then? Still, it was not there that He fell out with the Scribes.

It was in His treatment of those who did not keep the commandments. Instead of saying, as the Scribes said, that there was no hope for the publicans and sinners when the crash came, He set them on a level with, He even set them sometimes above, the Pharisees and Scribes—above the most punctilious of the observers of the Law. No praised and privileged caste could appreciate that. It was inevitable that their relations should become strained. And the disagreement widened when the Scribes discovered that Jesus laid so much stress on the motive and so little on the outward observance.

The other way of bringing about the catastrophe was that of the Zealots. We see very little of the Zealots in the Gospels. But Professor LAKE believes that they are always there. Much of the teaching of Jesus becomes intelligible, he thinks,

only when we place it in contrast to that of the Zealots. For the Zealots taught that the way to bring the present system to an end and inaugurate the new was to do as much mischief as possible to the enemies of God. 'Fight against them,' said the Zealots; 'resist them; rebel; destroy.'

Jesus taught the very opposite. The Kingdom will come, He said, not by fighting, but by suffering. And He offered Himself as an example.

Thus Jesus differed from both parties as to the method by which the end was to be hastened. But as to the form in which it would come He and they, says Professor LAKE, were entirely at one. The Scribes and the Zealots believed that it would be, not slow but sudden. So did He. They believed that the future would show, not a development of forces and tendencies, but a more or less rapid rush towards a great catastrophic upturn. So did He.

And He and they were wrong. That is Professor LAKE's conclusion. He does not think it is a serious thing to be wrong. Strange to say, he thinks it better than to be right. The eschatological hope was an illusion. It was not going to happen. 'But can we,' he asks in his persuasive way, 'can we be quite sure that illusions are not very often the source of progress? Let me take an example. What was the intention of Columbus when he discovered America? It was to find a way to India, and if he had not been under a complete illusion as to the geography of the world he would not have troubled to find what was then a wild and savage country.'

This is true of great men, he says, all through the history of the world. We need not dispute it. The point is: because Jesus was under an illusion He is not infallible. That is Professor LAKE's own conclusion. And so, simply because, in Professor LAKE's opinion, Jesus expected the end suddenly and soon, He is better out of the way. For it is impossible, he says, 'to find our Saviour in one who conditioned his teaching by Jewish apocalypticism, and believed in what was, after all, an illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God.'

Has Professor KIRSOPP LAKE any conception of what he is trying to do? He shows no single sign of it. He is quite well aware of the difficulty of the study of apocalyptic. He recognizes the variety of opinion among scholars. He knows that it is not possible for any man to be sure that he has come to the right conclusion upon the eschatological teaching of Jesus. And yet he says that the Christ in whom we have believed, we are to believe in no more. He imagines and calmly assures us that we can get along very well without Him.

We turn to the words of another Oxford scholar and we read: 'In a sense which is true of no other personality in history, Jesus Christ still lives and still speaks to the hearts of men. The truth of His message each man may test for himself, not by the process of historical inquiry and criticism alone, but by those deeper and more subtle processes, obedience and faith. There is a charm about His demeanour and a simplicity about His words that will always appeal to the student. But to know Him in all His power and beauty it is necessary to become not merely a student, but a disciple. To the inner Sanctuary of His presence there is only one password—My Lord and my God.'

The Tragic Schism: Can it be Healed?

By the Rev. J. A. Robertson, M.A., Edinburgh.

Christianity gathers round one central *fact* of history—the deed of Divine Forgiveness. The meaning of this fact spreads out until it is lost to human view in the far distances of eternity. The recognition of this has often led sincere souls,—it led Coleridge—to say that it must simply be accepted. It is a mystery; but *factum est*, and that ought to content us.

Yet the soul accepting is surely the soul in some measure understanding. There is a difference between the mystery which is an impenetrable horror of great darkness, and the mystery that is a vast luminous orb which you one day find yourself at the centre of—an orb of light shot through and through on every hand with rainbow harmonies. Christianity's central fact is in reality the most familiar and the most moving of human experiences—transfigured in the light of heaven. It is a mystery simply because its meaning cannot be exhausted by human description. It is exhaustless as the mind and heart of God. It is the mind and heart of God.

No man can stand to view the wide horizons of the Divine Heart without being conscious that his feet are on holy ground. Yet God does not bid us veil our eyes. It is no part of a genuine piety to do so. And, though we cannot hope '*in hoc vastum pelagus divinitatis navigare*,' we can learn something of the wonder of the ocean where the sun glints on the limpid green depths of the waves by the shore—perhaps even in the whisper of the shell.

I.

The deepest yearning of the human soul arises from *the sense of the absence of God.* The quest of Religion is to reach communion with God. When we take a bird's-eye view of the long panorama of evolution, we see nature operating through her patient laws to 'break, bloom, and blossom' at last into individuality. The true reading of the world reveals it as wholly given over to individuality. And this last result of the evolutionary process betrays its final source. The effect cannot be greater than its source. Its origin is the heart of an infinite spiritual Life. If the End of Creation is a society of individuals, then—speaking in the language of religion—the ground of Creation must have been the loneliness of God. This was the Divine Purpose—to produce a race of self-conscious beings—a kingdom of souls who should, by a life of moral effort and aspiration here, become fit for perfect communion with God. The screen of Nature and her slow-moving laws was His method of separating off such centres of personal life from the infinite Life. 'So exquisite is the delicacy of His non-obtrusion, so subtly sensitive is the Glory that conceals itself that He withdraws behind the veil of Nature and the operations of the mind and the ordinary movements of life, to give us the power of standing at a certain distance from Him, that we may contemplate and converse with Him, or, if we will, misdeem and forsake Him for a season.' The gift of spiritual freedom, moral consciousness, is God's way of entrusting to us a share in the fashioning of ourselves—for Him. Here, in man, the Divine Spirit immanent in Creation is reaching back to complete the circle of the creative process in personal fellowship with the personal God.

But if God is a personal and transcendent Being, then the yearning of the heart of man—which is part of the immanent Divine Spirit, groaning in Creation to reach back to the heart of God—is not the only spiritual activity at work to complete the circle of creative purpose. The heart of God is also engaged in a search, by personal ways, to reach us from above—in grace.

Once, in time, the circle was completed, when the Nazareth Boy, in the hour of moral maturity, surrendered Himself in perfect trust to this seeking Grace Divine, without any intervening period of failure, or sense of estrangement, or moral wretchedness; when 'the Son' whispered with unclouded consciousness into the listening silence of Eternity the mystic name, 'My Father.'

If there is any other sinless soul among mankind, let him make the same claim. For the mass of mankind moral consciousness begins with a feeling of disharmony, of inner estrangement, a sense of the absence of God. There may be many degrees of need for forgiveness among men, but the gracious forth-flowing impulse of the Heart of God, seeking from above for men, is received by all but the sinless in an experience of forgiveness.

Where shall we look for the Hand of God thrust through the Unseen in reconciling love, if not in Him in whom the circle of Creation was perfectly completed: in Him of whom alone the Spirit could say, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased'?

II.

It is with this 'tragic schism' we are here concerned—this misunderstanding and estrangement between the soul of man and God; this 'sense of the absence of God' as we have described it, so as to include all phases of the guilt-consciousness. And the problem—for God and for men—is how to turn the estrangement into friendship. What is it that takes place in that profound and moving moral experience, with which, in a broken and imperfect way, human nature is so pathetically familiar?

Must man do anything himself to bring the misunderstanding to an end? Can he make any reparation for the offence that lies at the root of the estrangement? Can the offender be the healer? Would anything that he could do to end the breach satisfy himself in the first place; but, above all, would it satisfy God?

Let us imagine a case of broken confidence between two human friends. You are the offender, let us say, and a very dear and valued friend the offended one. You know you are the offender. You feel you ought to take the initiative. Your conscience is reproaching you. What sort of reconciliation will satisfy that conscience of yours? You set about trying to undo the wrong. Suppose you succeeded perfectly. (Or—no! that is impossible. You may make good material loss or injury. But you can never wholly undo a wrong; indeed, in a sense you can never undo the smallest jot or tittle of a wrong—for the real wrong is a spiritual thing. Between you and the old glad past of perfect confidence a blinding rain, a mist of suspicion and distrust has fallen, and things can never, with that memory behind, be quite the same again). But suppose you had succeeded in paying back in full, so far as outward action can pay back, for all the damage done. And then, in the next place,—for the real injury is the wound to friendship,—suppose you came to your friend, and tried to undo that by confessing in sorrow, bitter and sincere, that you were wrong. Penitence has done its utmost. Is the wound healed, the reconciliation completed? . . . What of your friend?

Suppose your friend had just accepted your action, passively, silently, as a matter of course. Would you be quite content to call that a reconciliation? Would you not rather be inclined to come home and, shutting yourself in your room, say to yourself, in a flood of bitter weeping, 'For all that *I* have done we are as far apart as ever'?

There is a paradox here, but it is a real fact of experience and we must acknowledge it. The paradox is, that though you, the offender, feel that the reparation is yours to make good, yet the making good by outward deed and inward penitence—if that were all—would never satisfy you that a reconciliation had been brought about. It takes two to effect a reconciliation. *The offended one, also, must pass through an experience that is the complement and counterpart of all the bitter sorrow that you, the offender, have undergone in your effort after restoration.*

What, then, is it that must happen in the offended one's heart? Suppose we represent the offended one as breaking through the silence of the first encounter and offering you a bare acknowledgment of your efforts. Would you be satisfied? Your friend has held out his hand to you, but quite coldly, and in a voice of stony indifference said, 'Well, well; let by-gones be by-gones. I forgive you.' Would you be quite happy again? Would you not go home almost more miserable than before? The touch of that cold hand only repelled you, and you shrank within yourself. There was *no* reconciliation worthy the name.

There is a striking illustration in Mrs. Humphry Ward's *The Marriage of William Ashe.* It is the story of a rising young politician who is almost certain of the Premiership some day. He marries a young, winsome, but wayward wife—dashing, volatile, restless, unconventional, with a strain of French blood in her veins. She does things so shockingly outrageous to the society in which she is obliged to move because of her husband's position, that she well-nigh ruins his career. But again and again there is a reconciliation, and a fresh start made. She was never truly repentant; and at last she commits the grave sin of deserting him for another. Her fit of wayward caprice is soon over, and she repents, at length, in all the terrible bitterness of that word. Alas! that is, when all is said, the best, the only, undoing of a wrong that mortal man can make; and what a tragic penalty a real repentance is! She sends

and tells her husband; there is a sincere and childlike candour about her confession. From the wilderness of this heart in extreme bitterness the great call comes to the man—to forgive. What will the cost of a true forgiveness be for him? Will a mere word do? If he would take his wife to his heart again, he must surrender all—honour, and the fame of public service, the loftiest post in the land, the infinite riches of his life—for love. Society will certainly cast him off, if he stoops to associate himself with her once more. . . . He writes to her. He *says* he forgives her; he will make provision for her. But she is surely too sensible to think he can ever make her again what she once was to him. That is the burden of his letter, and it simply makes the poor broken heart bleed afresh. Womanly intuition—nay, the human heart in her—tells her there is no reconciliation, no real forgiveness there; and she will not come home, though there is nothing but death before her. The rich young ruler of this modern story realized that the call to forgive meant, 'Sell all that thou hast'—all thy dear-won social and political position. And the cost was too much for him. He went away sorrowful.

It is easy to say, 'I forgive'—and often very cheap. But if there is to be a genuine reconciliation, it is not merely the sinner, the offender, that has (in Bushnell's phrase) 'to make cost.' Repentance there must be, of course; but the only forgiveness that will satisfy the sinner is the forgiveness that comes through fire and water, out of the very depths of the heart of the wronged one, charged with all the tragedy of the wrong. Only forgiveness laden with the agony of the offence can be experienced by the wrong-doer as real forgiveness—can bring perfect assurance of restoration to the guilty soul.

III.

Is it then humanly possible to heal the misunderstanding between man and God? What is the extent of our offence against God? We have to remember here that the depth of our offence, our guilt, is measured not by what we think of it, but by what God thinks of it. Sin has sometimes been defined as selfishness. The definition is not without its usefulness, but it is only a weighing of sin in a human balance, not in God's balance. We do not see all our sinfulness by simply taking into account our relations with our fellow-men: we must try to see ourselves in the light of the purity of the Holy God with whom we have to do. Even of our most secret and private sins the question is, 'What has God to say?'

The moral and spiritual world has a law of gravitation of its own. Every particle of matter in the universe exerts an influence on every other to the remotest star in the furthest bounds of space. Not a stone falls but *some* change, however infinitesimally small, takes place in the arrangement of the forces of the Universe. It is the same in conduct. 'The evil that I did,' says Dr. Horton, 'passed out into the Universe with an influence the extent of which I can never measure, and the force of which I can never arrest. Just as pulsing out from our Sun goes the light which is reaching the nearest fixed star in the Centaur after three and a half years' travelling, and then will go on and on reaching different systems years and centuries after, so the sin I committed was as a little ray of lurid light: it passed out into an infinite Universe, travelled, and is travelling, on and on and on. I can never arrest it and I can never undo it. It is done, and it is attached to me, the doer, forever.'

The same writer instances the undertone of melancholy which ran through the preaching of John Donne, the eloquent Elizabethan divine—melancholy which betrayed the conviction that the licentious poems of his early unconverted days would live to corrupt and taint young lives centuries after his eloquent tongue was silent. He had had a glimpse of what his sin meant in the eyes of God.

> Action is transitory—a step, a blow,
> A movement of a muscle this way or that;
> 'Tis done, and in the after vacancy
> We wonder at ourselves as men betrayed.

Man's life is woven into the warp and woof of existence. Not a step can he take but it is caught up by this web of life, and 'is bent into directions and produces events which take place inevitably and without regard to our desires or regrets.'[1] Our smallest act lets loose some moral impulse for good or evil which vibrates to the end of the Universe. Our tiniest act of sin creates a discord which goes shuddering through all the soul of God. For the laws by which the Universe is upheld have their source and life in the character of God. The moral basis and the cosmic conditions of Divine

[1] A. C. Bradley, in *Shakespearean Tragedy*.

forgiveness are one and the same. In the eyes of All-holy Omniscience individual guilt must be swathed in cosmic gloom.

Taking our stand upon the Pantheism of Paul, let us try to express this in a picture which, however crudely materialistic in itself, may yet be a shadow of the truth. 'God,' says Paul, 'is in all, and through all, and over all'; 'of him, and through him, and to him are all things'; 'of him are all things, and we in him'; 'in him we live, and move, and have our being.' Creation, in Goethe's phrase, is 'the living garment of Deity.' 'God is in the city'—that is a familiar mode of speech with us: it is still truer and more heart-searching to say, 'The city is in God.' We often speak of the Spirit of God moving through the valleys and plains with their burthen of teeming human life: it is still truer to say that the communities of the valleys are like nerve-tracks lying along the breast of God. A sordid sin takes place in some populous valley. The news sweeps from end to end in a little hustling, hurrying breeze of gossip, moving the cynical to laughter, the vulgar to filthy talk, the decent to a shrinking shame, and those whom it most nearly concerns to a bitterness as of death itself. The moral tone of the valley is lowered, its life depressed, by it. Some soul, a life-cell in that nerve-track has gone wrong, and created a discord which jars through the entire length of it: an exquisite agony of quivering pain, which registers itself in the soul of God! The moral filth and slime of cities—fester-spots; the red wound of war across a continent — causing a deep, shuddering horror, or reflected as a great redness of shame, in the holy heart and soul of God! God is a great throbbing, sensitive, tender Heart of Love in which the failure, sin, and shame of man *lives*—beats—burns. The eyes of guilt look up and call it 'Wrath.'

> I heard a voice upon the slope
> Cry to the summit, 'Is there any hope?'
> To which an answer pealed from that high land,
> But in a tongue no man could understand.
> And on the glimmering limit far withdrawn
> God made Himself an awful rose of dawn.

IV.

Does it not seem, then, that this misunderstanding between man and his Maker is too great to be healed? If in a case of separation between human friends it is impossible for the wrong-doer to pay down in full for all the damage done, and completely undo the wrong, how much less possible is it for the wrong-doer to do anything to restore the broken relation, when the case is between man and God? Our sins are discords which go jangling through all the ordered harmony of the world, and are therefore injuries to God. As Anselm puts it, the smallest sin is an insult to the Supreme Being. It is therefore an infinite insult; therefore something not to be committed to save worlds from perdition. Though we possessed a world—nay, many worlds,—and offered them all to God in atonement for sin, they would be insufficient. Further, just because we have sinned, and thus blunted the conscience, because we are finite and ignorant, we cannot realise the extent and depth of our sin, and therefore cannot feel a penitent sorrow for our offence that could be anything like the measure of the wound it has caused to God's holy love. Only an Infinite Being, One greater than all worlds, can repair an infinite insult. Only the infinitely holy heart of an All-seeing God can feel the full pain and horror of man's sin against Him. We *ought* to make reparation, but only God *can*. That is the tragedy of sin. Is it, then, possible to repair the breach? It is not possible—unless God does it.

Has God done it? Can we be certain that God has reckoned and paid down all the infinite cost which the forgiving heart of the wronged one alone can and must pay, if there is to be a perfect reconciliation? Can we be assured that God's forgiveness has come to us, out of a heart that has laboured with an agony deeper than all the infamy of human sin? To that question we must next address ourselves. The answer can be stated here in a single word—*Christ*. That Life of tragic sorrow was the cost of forgiveness to God. The Cross was God's heart broken at length in His effort to give Himself again to the being who had caused the terrible estrangement. The more we gaze on that Crucified One, the more certain do we grow that it is not in hell that all the agony of all the world is felt. It is in the heart of God. It is only there. And 'there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'

'Breach for Breach,' and 'the Breach of his People.'

By the Rev. G. Buchanan Gray, D.Litt., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford.

It may be questioned whether either of the two phrases which I have placed at the head of this article conveys to most readers of our English Versions any clear and sharply defined idea; or whether, if such an idea is conveyed to a reader, it corresponds to the meaning of the Hebrew text. Nor, English usage being what it is, could anything else be expected. We may speak of a person as suffering from a broken leg, or even as suffering from fracture; we do not speak of any one as suffering from a breach, or even as suffering from a breach in the leg. Yet if 'breach' does not suggest bodily injury, there are certain passages in the English Versions of the Old Testament in which the use of the word must necessarily obscure, if it does not positively misrepresent, the meaning of the original. And, unfortunately, this obscure term receives no explanation in some even of our most recent commentaries. For example, no explanation is offered of 'breach for breach' in Lv 24^{20}, either in the Century Bible or in the Cambridge Bible; or of 'broken with a great breach,' in the Century Bible on Jer 14^{17}. Under these circumstances there is room for a discussion of some of the passages in which 'breach' occurs in the English Versions, together with some of those in which the Hebrew term so rendered occurs in the original text.

The word 'breach,' or its plural 'breaches,' occurs thirty-five times in the A.V., and thirty-four times in the R.V. In the A.V. it renders—or, in a few cases, forms part of the rendering of—not fewer than seven different Hebrew words; in the R.V. of not fewer than five. It occurs most frequently, and especially where, as *e.g.* in Am 4^3, a breach in a wall is referred to, most appropriately, as a rendering of *pereṣ*, or as a part of the rendering of the verb from the same root.[1] The word which is rendered by 'breach' with the next frequency is *bedeḳ* (2 K $12^{5bis\ 6.\ 7bis\ 8.\ 12}$ 22^5), and again the rendering is open to little objection, except on the ground perhaps that some other English term than that used for *pereṣ* would have been more convenient. The occasional use of 'breach' to render certain other words[2] need not detain us. What we are concerned with is passages in which 'breach' renders *sheber*. These number six in the A.V. (Lv 24^{20}, Ps 60^2, Pr 15^4, Is 30^{26}, Jer 14^{17}, La 2^{13}) and four in the R.V., which has a different rendering in Pr 15^4 and Is 30^{26}.

Etymologically, nothing is clearer than the Hebrew word *sheber*: it is a noun from the familiar root *shbr*, *to break*. It is this, doubtless, that led the translators of the A.V. to render it by *breach*, and the Revisers to retain this rendering in four passages. Unfortunately, as we have seen, the range of meanings in *sheber* and *breach* is by no means the same; and the English translators, and especially the Revisers, betray their doubts as to the legitimacy of the rendering *breach* by abandoning it in a number of passages very similar to those in which it is retained. Thus A.V. and R.V. alike render *sheber*, not by 'breach,' but by 'hurt' in Jer $8^{11.\ 21}$ 10^{19}; and also in Jer 6^{14}, where, however, the A.V. gives on the margin as alternatives 'bruise' or 'breach,' and the R.V. margin gives the alternative 'breach.' R.V. substitutes 'hurt' as a rendering of *sheber* for 'breach' (A.V.) in Is 30^{26}, and for 'bruise' (A.V.) in Jer 30^{12}, Nah 3^{19}; and for 'affliction' (A.V.) in Jer 30^{15}. On the other hand, R.V. retains the rendering 'affliction' in Am 6^6, and follows A.V. in giving 'destruction' as yet another rendering of *sheber* in La 2^{11} 3^{48} 4^{10}, in the first of these passages only giving 'hurt' as an alternative in the margin.

This great variety of renderings, even in a group of similar passages, is partly due to a real uncertainty as to the precise force of the word *sheber* in a given passage. Something almost as general as 'destruction' seems to be required by the context in La 4^{10}, as it certainly is sometimes else-

[1] Gn 38^{29}, Jg 21^{15}, 2 S 5^{20} 6^8, 1 K 11^{27}, 1 Ch 13^{11} 15^{13}, Neh 4^7 6^1, Job 16^{14}, Ps 106^{23}, Is 30^{13} 58^{12}, Am 4^3 9^{11}—fifteen times in all in A.V. R.V. also so renders in Job 30^{14}, 1 Ch 14^{11}, but renders otherwise in 2 S 6^8 (=1 Ch 13^{11}).

[2] These are: (1) בקיעים, Is 22^9; הבקיע, Is 7^6, Ezk 26^{10}; and in R.V. only נבקע, 2 K 25^4, Jer 52^7; הבקע, Jer 39^2; (2) רסיסים, Am 6^{11}; (3) מפרצין, Jg 5^{17} (A.V. only); and (4) תאוותו, Nu 14^{34} (A.V. only).

where (*e.g.* Jer 4^6); but it is doubtful whether the meaning is not more precise even in the very similar sentence in La 3^{48};[1] and I believe it to be tolerably certain that in the remainder of the passages cited in the last paragraph *sheber* means some form of bodily injury. The figure before the mind as these several passages were written was of an injured human body; the same figure ought to be brought before the mind of the English reader; but general renderings like 'affliction' and 'destruction' call up no single clear picture; and 'breach,' if it clearly suggests a picture at all, probably suggests the wrong one. I proceed to a closer examination of some of the passages in question, in the course of which we may consider whether in any or all cases any particular form of bodily injury is more especially suggested by the word *sheber*. But even if bodily injury in general be denoted, and not any particular form of such injury, the rendering *breach* is inappropriate, and even the rendering *hurt* is too general, for a man may be hurt in other ways than on his body.

I turn first to Lv 24^{20}—the *lex talionis*. This runs in E.VV. as follows: 'And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him; breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.' In spite of their terseness, the last two clauses are clear: if a man has caused another the loss of an eye or a tooth, he must himself be deprived of eye or tooth. Of course these are merely illustrative instances of a general principle; but what is the first illustrative instance? The first clause certainly does not mean that if a man has made a breach in his neighbour's wall, a breach must be made in his wall, as the familiar usage of the term *breach* might suggest to an English reader; it refers to some form of bodily injury, but not to bodily injury in general, for like the two clauses that follow, this first clause must be specific. The clause means: if a man breaks some part of his neighbour's body, that part of his own body must be broken. Like ourselves, the Hebrews were accustomed to speak of broken hearts and broken bones. We also speak of broken skin; whether the Hebrews did the same is less clear. Unless they did so, the *lex talionis* is specifying in particular broken bones, for broken hearts can scarcely have entered into the consideration of the framers of the law. The slight freedom of translation—if so it be regarded—may therefore be pardoned in the Polychrome Bible,[2] which brings out the real meaning clearly by rendering the three clauses, 'limb for limb, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.' The first clause in Leviticus thus takes the place of two clauses specifying the limbs in Ex 21^{24}, which runs: 'eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot.' If a man break another's hand, foot, leg, or arm, or by implication any other bone, his own must be broken. The illustrative instances specified in the Code of Ḫammurabi (§§ 196, 197, 200) are thus the same as in Lv 24^{20}, the verb in the clause of the code which refers to the bone being from the same root as the Hebrew term which is rendered 'breach' in E.V., 'limb' in the Polychrome Bible, and which actually means *what is broken*, this being limited in certain contexts to what is broken in the human body, and particularly the bones. It may be convenient to cite[3] the three clauses from the Babylonian Codex, and I will add the original of the 'bone' clauses:

'§ 196. If a man have destroyed (*úḫ-tap-pi-id*) the eye of a gentleman, they shall destroy his eye.

'§ 197. If he have broken a gentleman's bone, they shall break his bone (*šum-mae ṣmet a-wi-lim iš-te-bi-ir eṣemta-šu i-šĕ-ib-bi-ru* (= וישברו).

'§ 200. If a man have knocked out (*it-ta-di*) the tooth of a man of his own rank, they shall knock out his tooth.'

It may also serve further to illuminate the term *sheber* as used in Lv 24^{20}, and to prepare the way for the understanding of other passages in which the word is used and is rendered by 'breach' in the E.VV., if we have before us at this point certain passages in which the verb which is used in § 197 of the Code of Ḫammurabi, and with which the Hebrew noun *sheber* is cognate, occurs.

I cite first Lv 21^{19}. This occurs in an enumeration of various bodily defects that render a priest unfit for sacrificial duties: the verse is rendered very idiomatically in R.V.—'a man that is broken footed or broken handed'; but had the Revisers kept to the rendering of *sheber* which they ad-

[1] If *sheber* is rightly rendered destruction in La 3^{48}, we should have an interesting instance of the same phrase (שבר בת עמי) used with different meanings in Jer. and La.

[2] *The Book of Leviticus*, by S. R. Driver and H. A. White.

[3] From R. W. Rogers (*Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 445).

mitted in some other passages, they would have rendered—'a man in whom is a breach of the foot, or a breach of the hand.'[1] The term *sheber* is here commonly and rightly understood to refer to broken bones—the bones of the hand and the foot in particular, though perchance it may also have included malformations producing a similar appearance or effect to that which would arise from actual fracture. Among the defects which render an animal unfit for sacrifice is its being 'broken or maimed' (Lv 22^{22}); the second of these terms (*ḥārûṣ*) appears to mean really 'having had its flesh cut into'; the first (*shābûr*) means *broken* (*in limb*).

Ought we, however, to infer from Ex $22^{10\,(9).\,14\,(13)}$ that *sheber*, *shābûr*, *nishbār*, though etymologically meaning *what is broken*, became in usage extended to mean any hurt received by a human or animal body? This appears to be the view underlying the use of the term *hurt* in several passages in the R.V., some of which have already been referred to; and it may receive at first sight some support from the law regarding responsibility for animals entrusted or lent to another by their owner (Ex $22^{10\,(9)}$), the first part of which in the R.V. reads: 'If a man deliver unto his neighbour an ass, or an ox, or a sheep, or any beast, to keep; and it die, or be hurt (i.e. *nishbār*), or driven away, no man seeing it,' etc.; for here the law contemplates two cases of complete loss to the owner of the animal—loss by death and loss by raiders—and one of partial loss, namely, loss through injury. But the crucial question is: does the law regulate by an exhaustive statement of possibilities, or, as in the *lex talionis*, by typical instances? In the first alternative, *be hurt* would be the more satisfactory rendering; in the second, it would be better to keep nearer to the fundamental meaning of *nishbār*, and to render *get* (*a limb*) *broken*. In favour of the second alternative it may be noted that the law does not exhaust possibilities; for it does not refer to strayed cattle. Moreover, in v.$^{14\,(13)}$ the instances are abbreviated still further to one only of complete loss, and one of partial loss.

With the inconsistency that marks the E.VV. in their renderings of *sheber*, *nishbār*, etc., the rendering 'hurt' is abandoned in a prophetic catalogue of hazards to cattle in favour of 'broken'; and this latter rendering, if we understand it to mean *broken* (*in limb*), no doubt gives us the right turn of meaning in Ezk 34^{4} (cf. also v.^{16}): 'The diseased [sheep] have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost.' Similarly E.V. has 'broken,' not 'hurt,' in Zec 11^{16}.

As a further example of the verb *shebar* in connexion with broken limbs, and of binding up as the most conspicuous element in the treatment of fractures, Ezk 30^{21} may be cited; not, however, from the E.V. with its curious reference to a 'roller,' but from Professor Toy's translation: 'I break the arm of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and it shall not be bound up, so that healing applications may be made, and bandages put on, to make it strong to grasp the sword.' Naturally enough the more general term *to heal* (רפא) could also be used for the treatment of bones that had been broken (Zec 11^{16}).

I come now to the passages in which the Hebrew text speaks of the *sheber* (*bath*) *'ammi'* (or *ṣiyyôn*), and the E.VV. of the 'breach' or 'hurt of (the daughter of) my people (or Sion).' It is, I hope, obvious by now that *breach* is a wholly unsatisfactory rendering; is 'hurt' the best? Do these passages speak of some undefined bodily injury, or specifically of broken limbs or bones? I believe that in most of them at least the more specific reference is intended.

La 2^{13} is not without difficulties. The E.V. reads: 'What shall I equal to thee, that I may comfort thee, O virgin daughter of Sion? For thy breach is great like the sea; who can heal thee?' It is possible that R.V. refrained from substituting *hurt* here on the ground that *sheber* refers to breaches in the walls of the city; and it may be for a similar reason that Dr. Smith[2] renders:

> Vast as the sea is thy ruin:
> Who will restore thee?

But if the *personal* figure of the Virgin of Sion which was before the mind of the writer in the previous lines was dissolving into a vision of the actual ruins of the *city*, the pronoun at the end would almost certainly have been third person, referring to the breach, or ruin (cf. Ps 60^{2}); *thee* implies that the personal figure is still, or again (but that would be most improbable), before the mind of the writer. It is strange certainly to com-

[1] The Hebrew is איש אשר יהיה בו שבר רגל או שבר יד.

[2] G. H. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii. 277.

pare for size the fracture of bones and the sea; but it is not altogether certain that this comparison stood in the original text; if it did, we are faced with a choice of strange phrasing, treat the passage how we may.

With less justification R.V. retains *breach* in Jer 14^{17}, and thereby sadly obscures the figure. There is certainly no reference here to breaches in the walls of the city. Jeremiah's eyes run down with tears, not for a city in ruins, but because the body politic is desperately ill; he sees before him a human figure—the figure of a virgin which stands to him for his nation—'broken greatly (in body and limb), (wounded) with very grievous wounds.' He cannot unconcerned look on like those grandees of Samaria who quaffed their wine out of great bowls and used the choicest ointments for their own bodies utterly regardless of the 'broken (limbs)[1] of Joseph' (Am 6^{6}). Nay, rather, on account of 'the broken (limbs) of the daughter of his people,' Jeremiah also 'is broken,' *i.e.* feels himself broken in limb; for so, perhaps, if the text is correct, we should explain Jer 8^{21}, though the alternative suggested by Dr. Peake, that the prophet is 'broken' (-hearted), is also possible.

Though we speak, for example, of the 'Sick Man' of Europe, we do not so readily in speech or writing develop details of the figure in such personifications of a nation as the Hebrews did; and a translation is almost compelled at times to eliminate the personification by the substitution of vaguer terms or by substituting plural pronouns for singulars.[2] But we certainly ought not even in a translation to be deprived of more of the vividness of the original than is absolutely necessary; and if even the R.V. in Hos 7^{9} happily retains the striking figure of the personified people of Ephraim on whose head grey hairs are here and there appearing, there is no reason why the figure of Judah broken in limb should be concealed or blurred by substituting for terms describing bodily injury vague terms such as affliction, breach, or destruction.

A further passage to be considered is Jer 10^{19}: here the personified people is represented as the owner of a tent which has been spoiled and flung down, his children carried off, and he himself left behind beaten and with limbs broken, and therefore incapable of setting up the tent again, or finding any to do so for him. The picture is here expressed in words put into the mouth of the personified people: 'Woe is me for my broken (limbs)! my wounds are grievous: but I said, Truly this is my[3] sickness, and I must bear it. My tent has been spoiled, and all my cords are broken: my children have gone out from me, and are no more: there is none to stretch forth my tent any more, or to set up my tent-hangings.' Similarly in Jer $30^{12.\ 15}$, Is 30^{26}, we must substitute for the 'hurt' of R.V. some such term as 'broken (limbs),' if the passage in translation is to retain the vividness of the original.

The last passage I can discuss here, and perhaps the most striking of all, is Jer 6^{14}, repeated at 8^{11}. Again the condition of his people is seen by Jeremiah under the figure of a man with broken limbs; neighbours easily assume the *rôle* of a surgeon; they bind up the broken limbs, it is true; yet they do it carelessly and light-heartedly, with no thought of the shock that the injuries have caused, but ready at once to cry, It is all well again. Both the injured man and the careless healers represent the Jews of Jeremiah's time: the injured man is the whole nation; the healers are the individuals that compose the nation. A similar double representation occurs in Hos $2^{2(4)}$. In this passage the E.VV. by translating *sheber* by 'hurt,' and *shalôm* by 'peace' completely obliterate the picture which Jeremiah saw and with a few masterly strokes portrayed. *Shalôm* may, of course, in a suitable context mean *peace*; but what has peace to do here, where bodily injury and the healing of it are in question? Quite clearly, the word is used in its familiar sense of *well* (*in health*); as it is, to mention but two passages, in Gn 29^{6} 43^{27}. And then how poor a rendering is 'hurt' in such a passage as this. Even if we cannot be quite certain that *sheber* refers to broken *bones* in particular, it certainly does imply some severe bodily injury; it would not, for example, have been applied to a trifling hurt, such as a child receives when it stumbles. And yet if

[1] The word *sheber* here is very inadequately represented by the generalized *affliction* of R.V.

[2] As *e.g.* in the R.V. of Jos 9^{7}, 1 S 5^{10}. See more fully the note in my *Commentary on Numbers* ('International Critical Commentary'), pp. 265 f.

[3] Reading חלי for חלי. There can be little doubt that חלי could be used of a person suffering from broken limbs; it is actually used of the condition of Ahaziah when he fell out of the window of his upper chamber (2 K 1^{2}).

Jewish children were like, and treated like, English children, Jeremiah may actually have been using *sheber* in implicit contrast to such trifling hurts. A little child hurts itself, cries, is kissed, and told that all is well again, and is happy; and in this case all is well. But these people treat the desperate injuries from which Judah is suffering in the same way! 'They have healed the broken (limbs) of my people lightly, saying, Well (again). Well! (no, indeed!) nothing at all is well.'

Literature.

MODERN RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS IN INDIA.

THE President of the Hartford Theological Seminary, U.S.A., never made a better choice than when he invited the Rev. J. N. Farquhar, M.A., to deliver the Lamson lectures. The subject of the Lamson lectures is the Religions of the World. Mr. Farquhar could not have lectured well on all the Religions of the World. Only a rare scholar, like Professor Moore of Harvard, would dare to lecture or to write on them all. But Mr. Farquhar could lecture on *Modern Religious Movements in India* better than any man living. And he was invited to make that the subject of his lectures and his book (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

He realized the difficulty of his task. But he has spent sixteen years in India studying these movements. He has a singularly keen and orderly mind. He spares neither himself nor his friends in his search for truth. And beyond all else he has the requisite sympathy. The article which he contributed to the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS on the Brahma Samaj introduced him, probably to the President of Hartford, certainly to most of its readers, as an ideal writer on a subject which has not had many writers of any kind.

Whether it is the subject—so near in thought, so far in expression—that attracts us, or whether it is the necessarily abundant element of human life and experience which the book contains, there is no resisting its strong attraction. Perhaps something is due to the clearness of the style and the arrangement of the material. Mr. Farquhar describes first of all those movements which favour serious reform, of which the Brahma Samaj is the chief; next those movements which introduced into the reform some defence of the old faiths, such as the Arya Samaj; then those movements which aimed at out and out defence of the old religions, of which Theosophy is the most notorious. Here he includes the Sectarian movements in Hinduism and the Caste organizations. Religious Nationalism is the topic of the fifth chapter; Social Reform and Service the subject of the sixth; while the last chapter explains the significance of the movements.

In explaining the significance of the movements, Mr. Farquhar draws our attention to the fact that throughout all the period of reform, say from 1828 till now, there has been a steady advance of the ancient faiths. But he adds—and with his words we shall close this notice—'The triumphant revival of the old religions, with their growing body-guard of defence organizations, has been accompanied by *continuous and steadily increasing inner decay*. This most significant of all facts in the history of these movements seems to be scarcely perceived by the leaders. They believe that the danger is past. This blindness arises largely from the fact that they draw their apologetic and their inspiration almost entirely from Rāmakṛishṇa, Vivekānanda, Sister Niveditā, Dayānanda, and Mrs. Besant; and it is clear that neither capable thinking nor clear-eyed perception can be bred on such teaching as theirs.'

CHRIST IN ART.

It is better, when we have the opportunity, to occupy ourselves with great things than with small, whether it be a text of Scripture or a work of art. A great subject will sometimes rescue a mediocre book from obscurity, of which we have a notable example in Mrs. Jameson's *History of our Lord in Art*. But when the book really rises to the magnitude of its subject, as is the case with *The Christ of the Men of Art*, by the Rev. J. R. Aitken (T. & T. Clark; 15s. net), there is no money that we would not be entitled to spend on the purchase.

The price of this volume is a surprise; for it contains three hundred and fifty-eight quarto pages of literature, one picture in colour, twenty reproductions in photogravure, and twenty-eight in half-tone. But if it had been published at two or three guineas, as it might have been, we should not have passed it by.

How great the subject is, and how it has attracted the artist and the litterateur—and never without some enrichment of life—may be seen by a glance at the Bibliography which Mr. Aitken has added to his volume. The history of Christ in Art is in a true sense the history of Christian Art. As Mr. Aitken says: 'All the world of art has gone after Him, and the greatest and best of the men of art have been strangely drawn to Him. The pathos, the beauty, and power of His life and death have entered the heart of the noblest among them and called forth tribute of gold. It has mattered little that the task has seemed impossible, and that their finest efforts have proved unsatisfying even to themselves. The spell of the Christ has been upon them, and they have given us, from pencil and brush, some of our deepest thoughts of the Son of Man.'

Yes, it is not portraiture only, it is not only an imaginative representation of the face of the Son of Man, that the great artists have given us, it is the expression of their own devotion, and through that expression insight into the mind of Christ, together with an added incentive to the *Imitatio Christi*. The value of Art for interpretation is well brought out by the author of this book. It is not his first object, perhaps, to bring it out. He does not forget that he is giving us a history of the development of Art in relation to its highest effort from century to century. But he never misses the significance of some new feature in a new portrait. It is not simply an added feature. It is not the doing of an individual imagination. It is a new interpretation, a new vision of the Face which makes a fresh appeal to every century, and separately to each seeing soul in it; but it is along the stream of previous effort, and it carries us a little nearer to the perfection in which we shall see Him as He is. Between 'the Christ of Byzantine Art' and 'the Christ of British Art' the way is long, but at every step of it we feel that we are coming nearer to the place where we would be.

Is there an authentic portrait of our Lord in the world? The question has been much discussed. Sir Wyke Bayliss occupied many pages of his most interesting book with it. He concluded that there is. Or perhaps it would be more correct to say that he began with that conviction and then pleaded for it. All other writers on the Christ in Art have gone against him, with the exception of Mrs. Henry Jenner. But Mr. Aitken does not dismiss the matter so summarily as others have done. He traces a family likeness, so to say, in portraits of great repute from the fresco in the cemetery of S. Domitilla and the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore. And then he says:

'Other portraits in fresco and glass, as well as other lines of "evidence," archæological, artistic, historical, call for attention on the part of those who would settle the question whether or no we have an authentic likeness of our Lord. Enough, perhaps, has been given here to show that the case in favour of such a portrait is not so weak as is sometimes supposed, and that there is no inherent improbability of there ever having been a portrait of our Lord. The art of portrait-painting was quite common in the days of His flesh and throughout the early centuries, and Love is loth to let its loved one fade away. The question of Christ's divinity can scarcely have troubled the early Christian converts, or the question whether it was right or wise to paint the face of their Friend. The fear of idolatry did not arise and smite the love of Christian men in the golden dawn of the world's new hope, or the fear of giving to Time a likeness that would lead men to worship a picture of their Lord rather than Christ Himself. It was quite natural for them to desire a portrait of their Lord, and quite in keeping with the deepest and most sacred thoughts of men everywhere to desire to look on the face of One who touched with so kind a hand the deepest and noblest things in the life of the world. Christ stood to the early Christian Church for more than we sometimes think—a great and winning love; a friendship true and strong as death; a fine and gracious sacrifice that had no thought of self or fear of woe; a pity that broke into tears and made the heart tender for ever; a compassion that sent out its hands and its feet wherever there was sorrow or pain; strength sufficient to bear all the wounds of life; and faith that dared to face death's darkest night, and conquered. He was their Friend, and they painted Him in fresco on their walls, or wore Him in miniature against their beating hearts. He was

their Saviour, and they painted Him in gold on their Communion cups, that they might look on His face when they drank the blood-red wine. He was their Hope, and they painted Him on linen cloths to lay on the darkened faces of their dead. And He was their Comfort and Strength, and they painted, in love, the pitiful, compassionate words of Jesus, His strong, triumphant works, and sang of them, in colour, in the darkest hours of persecution.

'To say all this, however, is not to prove that we have a "portrait" of Christ or that the chain in favour of the traditional "likeness" is complete, but merely to show that the evidence is stronger far than is sometimes admitted, and that there is no inherent improbability of there ever having been a portrait of our Lord. There is point in the taunt: "Men are so slow of heart to believe things concerning Him. They tear the corolla to pieces, not knowing. Their hands are wet with the living sap, and they think it is only from dew that fell an hour ago. They pass through the Catacombs, and observe paintings on the walls by Roman artists, in the Roman style, of a Roman Youth, a Fair Shepherd, an Orpheus, a David; and they say, 'These are imaginary pictures of Christ—these are not likenesses of Christ—we have no likeness of Christ—we have no likeness but that of Cæsar!'"'

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

In issuing *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (T. & T. Clark; 12s.)—the new volume of the 'International Critical Commentary'—Dr. Alfred Plummer tells us that by the death of Dr. Briggs in June 1913 and of Dr. Driver in February 1914, he has been left alone to edit the New Testament volumes. He tells us also that by the ill-health and over-work of Dr. Robertson, Bishop of Exeter, he has been left as the sole author of this volume. Is it then the sense of responsibility, or is it freedom from restraint, that has so acted upon Dr. Plummer as to enable him to produce by far the finest of all the commentaries that he has written? No doubt Dr. Plummer, like all strong men, daily learns to be and do better. But there is a grip of the essential things and an ease in handling the lighter things in this volume which seem to tell of more than normal development. Perhaps the Epistle has specially appealed to him. That is probable enough. For his work has recently been closely connected with its problems. In any case, this is the work that we shall associate his name with most readily until he lives to give us a greater. Plummer and Robertson on Second Corinthians might have been a good companion to Sanday and Headlam on Romans. But we should have been content with Sanday or with Headlam alone on Romans. We are very well satisfied with Plummer on Second Corinthians.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

With all the books that have been written on the Oxford Movement, the whole story has never been told in English. In French it was told fifteen years ago by Paul Thureau-Dangin. But it is only now that a translation of his great work, *The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century*, has been made. The translation was done by the late Wilfred Wilberforce. It is published in two large octavo volumes by Messrs. Simpkin & Co. (31s. 6d. net).

M. Thureau-Dangin writes from the Roman Catholic side and makes no secret of his attitude. But he is a liberal Roman Catholic. He quotes with unreserved approval the opinion of certain Anglicans who had passed over to Rome, notably Manning, that there were good men left in the Church of England. He says:

'Far from being embarrassed and vexed by this sanctification of their brothers who were separated from them, the Catholics ought, therefore, to have blessed God for it; so that Manning, in 1866, proclaimed his joy at every example of conformity with the Catholic Church shown by the English Church.'

And after quoting from *The Month* an appreciation of Pusey's good faith and saintliness, he says again:

'Here we see the truly Catholic idea, in the light whereof we must regard the evolution which, during more than half a century, has been in progress in the Anglican Church. Let us not lose sight of it. It will enable us without difficulty to do justice to some noble souls; it will help us to retain our hopes, even in face of temporary disappointments; it will give us, as far as we are capable of receiving, a more complete understanding of the designs of Providence.'

From beginning to end the Movement is spoken of in the most laudatory terms. Perhaps we ought to remember that the language of a Frenchman conveys more when turned into our prosaic English tongue than it does to the author and his fellow-countrymen. But, after all, this is the book to read on the Oxford Movement. Let us always hear the best that can honestly be said of movement or of man. Even with Cardinal Manning our author is sympathetic. There are certain episodes in his life with which he has difficulty, but he gives Manning the benefit always. Once at least he ignores the very plain account of Manning's treachery regarding Newman's cardinal's hat which is given not only in Manning's but also in Newman's biography. And you would never discover from M. Thureau-Dangin that Manning persecuted his more distinguished rival successfully throughout the pontificate of Pius IX. It is all due to his consideration for Manning, not to dislike of Newman. Perhaps he does not idolize Newman quite as others have done, historians as well as disciples. But he does not fail (how could he?) to make him a greater man as well as a greater saint than Manning.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland has discovered a historian. The Rev. James MacCaffrey, Ph.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, wrote some time ago a *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, which was well received. He has now written a *History of the Catholic Church from the Renaissance to the French Revolution* (Gill; 2 vols., 12s. 6d. net). The new book will decide any doubter. Professor MacCaffrey is unmistakably a historian.

The title is not well chosen. The limits indicated by it are transgressed, sometimes by excess, sometimes by defect. Moreover, very great disparity exists in the treatment of countries. The history of the Catholic Church in Scotland from the Renaissance to the French Revolution is dismissed in rather less than fifty pages; while Ireland receives more than two hundred. Of course this disparity is easily understood. Dr. MacCaffrey writes as a Roman Catholic and an Irishman. And it is easily forgiven. He knows Ireland best; it is right that he should take space to tell what he knows best. We are not at all astonished to find that the very style rises in grandeur and increases in warmth as soon as the history of Ireland is entered upon.

It is a capable history throughout. Not unpardonably prejudiced, even when Luther is mentioned, Professor MacCaffrey has taken pains with his sources and felt responsibility for his facts. If his style is never distinguished, it never falls below clearness and comfort. If we are never roused to enthusiasm, we are never deprived of quiet enjoyment.

What do we know of Ruysbroeck? As much as Maeterlinck tells us in his *Ruysbroeck and the Mystics* (so well translated by Miss Stoddart). There are a few other things in English—translations, selections, and magazine articles. But our knowledge is so limited that an independent study of the great mystic, as a man, together with an exposition of his leading doctrines, now offered by Miss Evelyn Underhill in 'The Quest Series,' under the title of *Ruysbroeck* (Bell; 2s. 6d. net), is most welcome. Miss Underhill's skill in making the abstruse concrete and the complex simple is here seen at its highest exercise.

The difficult but irresistible subject of telepathy is handled scientifically by Mr. J. C. F. Grumbine under the title of *Telepathy; or, The Science of Thought Transference* (Fowler & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). The book is an argument against materialism. For whatever thought is, and however it is transferred from one person to another, it is not a product of the brain. 'Telepathy,' says Mr. Grumbine, '—which literally means, sympathy from afar—and thought transference—which is a psychic process (not organic) of conducting thought from one mind to another—are established upon the a priori mode of generating and transmitting thought by divine inspiration. If God or the self in each one inspires the soul from within and not from without, by a deductive rather than an inductive method, that inspiration is not organic but spiritual. Telepathy is a science of mental as well as spiritual processes of thought transference.'

Mr. Grumbine is the author of a book on *Clairvoyance* which is issued by the same publishers (2s. 6d. net). This book tells us less about science and more about divinity. The divinity of which it tells us is the divinity of man, round which a

complete philosophical system is built up and called 'The System of Philosophy concerning Divinity.'

Mr. E. S. Buchanan, M.A., B.Sc., is rapidly building up a great reputation as an editor of Biblical texts. He has already edited and issued *The Four Gospels from the Codex Corbeiensis*, *The Four Gospels from the Codex Veronensis*, *The Epistles and Apocalypse from the Codex Harleianus* (1772, B.M.), *The Epistle of St. Paul from the Codex Laudianus* (Lat. 108, Bodleian), and *The Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse from the Codex Laudianus* (Lat. 43, Bodl.). Now he gives us an edition in Latin (21s. net) and in English (3s. 6d. net) of *The Four Gospels from the Latin Text of the Irish Codex Harleianus*, numbered Harl. 1023 in the British Museum Library (Heath, Cranton, & Ouseley).

Mr. Buchanan has much faith in the Versions. He does not think that Westcott and Hort's text is at all to be relied on. How could it be, he asks, when it is based on a single manuscript which is itself a revision? He agrees with Nestle (of whom he speaks enthusiastically) that for the primitive text we must study especially the Old-Latin Versions and the Sahidic (Egyptian) Version. Now there are certain Irish MSS. in the British Museum, gathered by Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, and his son Edward, which present an Old-Latin text. Their text is not purely Old-Latin, because, when the Vulgate reached Ireland, the Old-Latin MSS. were more or less altered into conformity with it. Mr. Buchanan has transcribed one of these MSS. *verbatim et literatim*, and had it printed in a beautiful type and enriched with two collotype facsimiles. But in translating the MS. he has used other MSS. where in the MS. he was translating he suspected alteration in conformity with the Vulgate. Thus the translation he offers is as nearly as he can make it that of the Old-Latin Version as represented by Irish Manuscripts.

The difference between this MS. and the Vulgate is sometimes considerable. Take two verses: 'And seeing Him they were amazed; and His mother said to Him, Son, why hast Thou thus dealt with me? Behold, I have sought Thee sorrowing. And He said to His mother, How is it that thou soughtest Me?'

'Whose soever sins ye remit, it is the Holy Spirit That shall remit them; and whose soever sins ye retain, it is the Holy Spirit That shall retain them.'

Numbers 128 to 133 of the 'People's Books' have been issued, and every one is a war book (Jack; 6d. net each). A history of *The Hohenzollerns* has been written by the Rev. A. D. Innes; *Treitschke*, the amazing product of *kultur*, has been characterized by Mr. Maximilian A. Mügge; *Belgium* is described by Mr. Frank Maclean; the capture of *Germany* by militarism is brought out clearly, though incidentally, by Mr. W. T. Waugh in the course of his six chapters, the last of which tells us what German Culture really is; Captain A. H. Atteridge puts into our hands a most convenient account of *The British Army of To-day*; and Mr. W. M. Conacher, a Canadian, helps the British soldier to converse with his French and Belgian comrades by means of *A French Self-Tutor*.

There is not a single sermon on the War in the Rev. William Wakinshaw's volume entitled *John's Ideal City* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net); and for that not a few will be thankful. Every sermon carries the Message of the Gospel, and is content. That message is made vivid by illustration and impressive by the speaker's manifest earnestness.

The most useful bit of work that Dr. Emil Reich did in all his restless life was the publication of *Select Documents illustrating Mediæval and Modern History*. The book was published in 1905. A cheap edition has been issued this spring (P. S. King; 7s. 6d. net). It contains first of all the great international treaties, from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 to the Second Peace of Paris in 1815. A much longer section is occupied with the documents of Church History. It begins with the Edict of Milan (313) and ends with the Bull 'Pastor Aeternus' of 1870, embodying the Papal Infallibility decree. Then follow the great deeds and documents of the Middle Ages according to the country of their birth. The book will now become better known and will be accepted as a most useful aid to the writer and the reader of History, both sacred and profane.

The Rev. Alexander Webster, formerly Unitarian minister in Aberdeen, has, in his retirement, published a history of the progress of theology in

Scotland. He calls it *Theology in Scotland, reviewed by a Heretic* (Lindsey Press). That means, presumably, that he feels himself out of touch with the prevalent theology, which no doubt he is. It also means that he criticizes it. But his criticism is kindly enough, and if it does no good, which would be a pity, it will do no harm. Mr. Webster signs the preface on his 75th birthday. But he does not claim the vigour which is everywhere felt throughout it; that is due to the fact that it is a gathering together of addresses made, and sometimes published, in the course of his ministry.

A handsome and attractively illustrated book, entitled *Footfalls of Indian History* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), has been published. The author is Sister Niveditā. When the Swami Vivekānanda visited England, he was joined by Miss Margaret Noble, who took the name of Sister Niveditā, or the 'dedicated one.' If you will turn to Mr. Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements in India*, you will read that 'Vivekānanda's English disciple, Sister Niveditā, settled in a small Hindu house in the northern part of Calcutta, and lived there a life of simple service for several years, visiting the Hindu homes around about her, conducting a school for girls in her own house, and leading young Hindus into practical service. She was a woman of deep romantic feeling and of considerable literary power. She readily picked up her master's method of glorifying Hinduism and Hindu life, and far exceeded him. Her chief work, *The Web of Indian Life*, shows, on the one hand, most remarkable sympathy with both the ideals and the actualities of Hindu life, and proves to every capable reader what a priceless help towards interpretation sympathy is, but, on the other hand, contains such exaggerated language in praise of Hindu customs and institutions, that many orthodox Hindus have protested against the book as altogether untrustworthy and as thoroughly unhealthy reading for young Hindus themselves. Yet Sister Niveditā had her reward. Though her book is unwise, she loved the Hindu people and served them; and they gave her their love. At her death, in October, 1911, there was an extraordinary outburst of feeling in the Hindu community of Bengal.'

This is the author of the new book. We are not told why it was not published till now. It consists of a number of independent chapters, some of which describe famous Indian places, and some discuss difficult Indian problems. All are written from the Hindu point of view, and all manifest strong sympathy with those places and ideas to which the Hindu heart clings. Behar and Benares are two of the places described; the Final Recension of the Mahabharata and the Rise of Vaishnavism under the Guptas are two of the problems discussed.

On a great subject read a great book. The book to read on *The Family* is Mrs. Helen Bosanquet's. It has just been reissued by Messrs. Macmillan (8s. 6d. net). The history of the family fills the first half of it; the second half is occupied with a philosophical account of the modern family. At the present moment the chapter of most interest, and perhaps of most service, is that on the Psychology of Family Life. But every chapter deserves, as it demands, the most painstaking study.

The problem of Church-going is acute in this country. It is more acute in the United States of America. Volume after volume is written and read about it, and all sorts of methods are invented to meet the mischief. One of the best books has been written by the Rev. Paul Moore Strayer. It is entitled *The Reconstruction of the Church* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). There are two ways in which the Church needs reconstruction—as to its message and as to its method.

Its message must be made more social. Mr. Strayer thinks it cannot be made *too* social. It must bring men together in Christ, and it must keep them together in business. He lays great emphasis on the necessity of business life being brought within the influence of the Church. And it is pleasant to see that so observant a man has great hope of the result. Already deeds are being done under Church influence which would, not long ago, have been undreamt of. He gives this example:

'A new moral standard and a new idealism in dealing with inventors was set by the Eastman Kodak Company in the summer of this year, 1914. Henry J. Gaisman discovered how to sign and date a film at the time the picture is taken. He is reported to have said that he would have taken $10,000 for his work, and have "jumped at" $50,000. Mr. Eastman paid him $300,000. First, Mr. Eastman fixed an adequate salary for

the four years during which the inventor had worked on his device, and that amount was doubled. Then the cost of the laboratory was agreed upon, and the amount doubled. To this total enough was added to make $300,000, not on the basis of what the device cost the inventor, but of its value in expected profits to the company. This marks a new era for inventors and for business ethics.'

Of the new methods Mr. Strayer has a great variety. One of them is advertising. Every large church should take a page advertisement in a leading paper at least once a week. More than that, its affairs should be in the hands of a good advertising agent always, just as the affairs of a newspaper are. Yet it is a restrained, well-considered, and well-written book.

In spite of the loud and apparently concerted attempt to throw ridicule on the study of Eugenics, that science, yet in its infancy, has a great future before it. There is no difficulty in understanding the offence it gives. Any science that touches heredity touches the conscience of the better and the convenience of the baser sort. Does Eugenics suggest that alcohol or immorality or overcrowding has to do with mental or physical weakness in offspring? That is enough. The mighty and well-disciplined army called 'the Trade' mobilizes at once, and it is reinforced by the scattered forces of the other trades that traffic in bodies and souls. It will be well for the follower of Christ to determine to make Eugenics a particular study, however painful that study may be.

A valuable contribution to its literature has been made by Dr. Henry Herbert Goddard. The book is published under the title of *Feeble-mindedness: Its Causes and Consequences* (Macmillan Company; $4 net). There is a training school for feeble-minded boys and girls at Vineland, New Jersey. Some time ago the Superintendent of the School promoted the establishment of a department of research. Of that department Dr. Goddard is the director, and this book is the first result of the research work.

It is to some extent a technical work. But the author has recognized the widespread interest that is taken in the subject, and has seen how useful to society it may be if the truth about feeble-mindedness and its causes could be made generally known. He has accordingly written as far as he possibly could in such a way that the 'layman' might understand. Thus, for example, he has given a clear exposition of what Mendelism means, though no doubt the biologist will think it unnecessary. In this way he carries the uninstructed fathers and mothers of the next generation with him, surely to their instruction if discomfort, and to the mighty advantage of the children that are to be born.

It is in many respects a trying book to read. Its many photographs are trying to look at. But there is encouragement in it, so much of the evil that exists being shown to be due to ignorance.

That there is a great revival of prayer since the War began is recognized. But it has not yet revived the Prayer-Meeting appreciably. It is the belief of the Rev. William T. Ward that the fault is with the Prayer-Meeting leader. He has written a manual for leaders. And by the very title he shows what the leader has to think about; for the title is *Variety in the Prayer-Meeting* (Methodist Book Concern; 50 cents net).

The best of the preachers in the United States are greatly under the influence of the Social Movement. The Rev. Charles W. Barnes in his book *Social Messages* (Methodist Book Concern; 50 cents) calls the recognition of brotherhood a new sanctification. He then proceeds to show how social was the message of certain great preachers of the past—Wesley, Kingsley, Maurice, Robertson—and ends with his conception of the social message of the modern preacher and how the modern church may open the way for it.

The Bible and Life (Methodist Book Concern; $1 net) is the first series of the Mendenhall Lectures. They were delivered at De Pauw University, by the Right Rev. Edwin Holt Hughes, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Bishop Hughes has dropped none of the old-fashioned simple love of the Bible, and he has dropped none of the Bible. He finds it the best guide for life in all the world. With much loving anxiety he tells us what the Bible has to say about Man, Home, Education, Work, Wealth, Sorrow, and Practice. Of all the chapters, that on Sorrow will be most treasured. For whatever else the Bible is, it is a comforter.

A new edition has been published of *The Gospel*

of Healing, by the Rev. A. B. Simpson, D.D. (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net). It is not a mere reprint, though a mere reprint is sometimes called a new edition; it has been revised and in some parts rewritten. For example, reference is made to the Conference of Representatives of the Clerical and Medical Professions which was held at the Chapter House of St. Paul's Cathedral, to discuss the asserted results and the rapid development of Spiritual and Faith-healing movements.

It is easy to say commonplace things about the Seven Words, and many a man has been satisfied so to do. Not the Bishop of Ossory. In his *Verba Crucis* (Mowbray; 1s. net) Dr. J. H. Bernard has given first a life's discerning experience and then special study to each of the Seven Words from the Cross, and every address has meaning and power in it. On the Cry of Dereliction he seems to say what *may* be said, neither less nor more.

The Rev. Robert Keable has written a careful exposition of *The Loneliness of Christ* (Nisbet; 1s. 6d. net), and has been able to redeem a popular subject from barren repetition.

The Holy Land in Geography and in History (Partridge; 5s. net) is a republication in one volume of two little volumes which have been the precious possession of students of the Bible for several years. The preciousness is not in the Geography or in the History, though they are both good, but in the maps. The most wonderful series of beautiful little maps are here—maps of every bit of country, maps of every physical feature, maps of every historical period and every historical place—one hundred and forty-five maps in all.

It is to be expected of an American lawyer—if he should condescend to give his mind to things theological—that he should discover the centrality of faith. For it *is* central. But it needs the trained eye and the disciplined will to see that. In *The Law of Faith* (Putnams; $1.50 net) this lawyer (Mr. Joseph F. Randolph) shows that in the Bible faith is not only central but all-controlling. He takes 'Faith in God,' and tells us what the Bible has to say about it. He does the same with 'Faith in Christ.' He takes 'Belief about Christ,' and tells us what the Bible has to say about that. He does the same with 'Faith in Word, Prophet, and Miracle.' And, to complete the subject, he tells us what the Bible has to say about Faithfulness—the Faithfulness of God and the Faithfulness of Man. Then at the end of the book he gives a complete list of all the places in the Bible where faith, or anything that has to do with faith, is referred to.

That there are many idle and ignorant people in the world to-day, people whose whole aim in life is to see and hear some new thing, is made painfully and shamefully evident by the encouragement given in Europe and in America to the missionaries of Hinduism. If these missionaries were not themselves idle and ignorant they would not be missionaries of Hinduism. Their ignorance is very deep indeed. A book has been published by Messrs. Putnam, under the title of *Hinduism in Europe and America* (5s. net), which makes an exposure of its appalling depth. 'If they would take the trouble to *read* the Gospels,' says the author, 'it might save them from the blunder of asserting that certain things "were borrowed from the sacred books of India" which are not to be found in either the one or the other!

'What can we say, for instance, when it is declared that "The Holy Ghost descended upon *Mary* in the form of a dove"? And that "this statement was taken from the Bhagavad-gita"?

'It is confidently declared that "Jesus of Nazareth borrowed his morals, his doctrines, and even his name from one Jezeus Christna of the Hindus"!

'The name of Krishna is thus misspelled apparently for the purpose of confounding his name with that of the Messiah. But the word Christ means "anointed," while Krishna means "black" or "dark-coloured." The vast difference in the signification of the names makes it impossible for scholars to suspect any kinship between the two.

'And yet, in defiance of all the principles of philology, one author declares: "In Sanskrit, Kristna, or rather Christna, signifies 'messenger of God, promised of God, sacred,' etc." If he had known the meaning of the word Christ he would of course have said that "Christna in Sanskrit means 'anointed'"!

'Another of the same class, and equally ignorant, asserts: "Christna as well as Buddha [enlightened]

means shepherd"! Still another of the same reckless sort declares: "Krishna means the sun"!

'In relation to Jezeus, one author pretends to quote from the Bhagavad-gita as follows: "They named him Jezeus, that is to say, the pure divine essence"! Of course there is nothing of the kind in the Gita, from one end to the other, but on another page of the same book we are assured: "The name of Jesus, or Jezeus, was in ancient India the consecrated epithet assigned to all incarnations"!

'The truth is, however, that there is no such name as Jezeus in Sanskrit—no name like it in the language, and Max Müller declares that "*it was simply invented*" by the author in question.'

The author of this book—Elizabeth A. Reed, A.M.—has done right well not to be merciful. The only fear is that the disease is too radical for even her knife.

The Child and the Nation, by Grace M. Paton (1s. net), gives an account of what is being done in elementary schools for the physical welfare of children. It is published by the Student Christian Movement (93 Chancery Lane, W.C.), for whom it has been directly written.

The number of indispensable books of reference is not large if one could but find the right books. One of them is *The English Catalogue of Books*, of which the volume for 1914 has been published (Office of the Publishers' Circular; 7s. 6d. net). And it is improving in usefulness every year: it is a more nearly complete record of the year's publications, and its entries are more accurate. It was not conspicuously inaccurate before; but the errors that are so hard to keep out of masses of names and titles and dates and prices now very rarely occur. When we add that the printing is clean and not too crowded we have said all that is necessary.

The Use of the Old Testament.

By the Rev. J. A. F. Gregg, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Dublin.

'The Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.'—2 Ti 3^{15}.

St. Paul is here speaking of the Old Testament. That was the only Bible he knew. The Old Testament was the Bible of our Lord and the Bible of the early Church. And how heavily both our Lord in the days of His flesh, and the Church of Apostolic days leant upon this Bible of theirs, may be seen by reference to the New Testament.

Jesus of Nazareth framed His life upon the lines laid down for Him in the Old Testament. It was His court of appeal. It was His armoury in moments of temptation. And so with the Apostles: the New Testament (it has been well said) is written in terms of the Old Testament. These matters are beyond doubt. For the Lord and His Apostles the Old Testament was an authority recognized and proved, and, as such, it is commended to us who come after. Not in itself, but through faith which is in Christ Jesus it is able to make us wise unto salvation.

But it may well be asked if the Old Testament does serve this purpose for Christian men of to-day. Do not men rather fight shy of it? Are they quite sure of it? Is it not the case that the rather free handling to which the Old Testament has been subjected has lessened the deference with which it should be approached?

I think there can be little doubt that this is so; the Old Testament does not hold the place in men's minds that it once did. But this is wrong. Nothing has occurred to shake the authority of the Old Testament in the least degree. Whatever authority it had for the Lord and His Apostles was spiritual; it was connected with the deepest religious import of the Old Testament: and whatever it was to them, it was, not because they read into it something that was not there; not because, being Jews, they dared not challenge its venerable wisdom; but because the same Spirit of God who had inspired its writers long before was now inspiring them, and was quickening their vision to see the truth of God that lay in its heart. And

this truth which they saw in it was eternal truth, the truth that is true in every age, truth that is as true for us as ever it was to them. And it is only when you and I see the Old Testament as a vehicle of this truth, when we look for this truth in it and find it, that the Old Testament will be to us the strength and illumination that it is meant to be.

But how can this be? I am asked. You contend for the historicalness of the New Testament with an urgency which you never display in connexion with the Old Testament. The Bible is one, and yet you do not treat it as one. When you deal with reported miracles in the Old Testament, you seem to explain them away; on the other hand, you expend considerable time and labour in defending the miracles of the New Testament. You are not consistent; you don't encourage us to trust the Old Testament. Such an objection can, I know, be put forward. But I do not think it is valid. It might be valid if the purpose of the Old Testament and of the New Testament was identical; but inasmuch as their object is different, and the Old Testament aims at one thing and the New Testament at another, the objection cannot be pressed.

For what the Old Testament aims at doing is this, to bring before us the growing religious light which shone through Israel; to present us with the development of the religious ideas which influenced the people: on the other hand, it is not so much ideas as facts, historical facts which belong to a definite moment in time; it is with these that the New Testament is concerned.

The Christian religion is above all things a historic religion, a religion resting upon facts of history, and we cannot say quite the same of Judaism. The Person of Christ, as revealed at a given point in time, is the definite burden of the New Testament. Christ, born among men as the Incarnation of the Divine Word, Christ the Sacrifice for sin upon the Cross, Christ the Conqueror of Death through a miraculous Resurrection, Christ the Renewer of His Church through the Holy Spirit sent from heaven; why, here we have a historic revelation, the very essence of which is its association with place and time.

But what has the Old Testament to show by the side of this? There is no person, or event, by which the Old Testament finally stands or falls. It is not the historicalness of its events, it is its religious ideas, which make the Old Testament the sacred treasure-house that it is. And the difference between what we look for in the Old Testament (viz. religious ideas) and what we look for in the New Testament (viz. the history of a Person) is forced upon us by the difference in the character of the Old Testament and the New. The historical books of the New Testament, *e.g.* the Synoptic Gospels, date from within thirty or forty years of the events recorded, and are based on sources which might almost be called contemporary. But the case is very different with the historical books of the Old Testament. Hundreds of years (and in some cases a thousand years or more) separate the writing of the records from the events which they record. That is to say, though there is no doubt a very large skeleton of historical fact underlying the Old Testament documents, there is nothing to show that much of the flesh (as it were) with which the bones are covered is literal history, and may not be due to the reflexion and pious imagination of subsequent ages. *E.g.* where questions of miracle are involved, it is natural (and it is right) to approach a religious document with a presumption against those apparent breaches of uniformity which we call miracles. Very strong contemporary evidence is required if we are to overcome our antecedent hesitation. We go to the New Testament and find that the contemporary evidence for miracle there is as strong as for the commonplace, and that we cannot excise the miracles from the evidence without discrediting the evidence for everything. And accordingly in the New Testament we have to say that the testimony *for* miracle is so strong that our presumption *against* miracle must give way.

But how different it is in the Old Testament! What is the evidence for miracle there? It is, in comparison, very slender.

It would ill become a believer in the supernatural to say that no evidence for the miraculous that it produces would be strong enough to overcome our antecedent objections. There are instances of prophetic prediction, *e.g.*, which it is very hard to make anything of except on the assumption that they are genuine. But, for all that, there are very many stories of miracle in the Old Testament for which the evidence as it stands is insufficient. It is not on the ground that God could not have done them that we hesitate: it is on the ground that we have not sufficient evidence

to assure us that He did, as a matter of fact, do them. No man could be called, with any fairness, a sceptic because he was not coerced by the evidence offered for the miracles connected with the Exodus, or with the record of Elijah and Elisha, or with the story of Balaam, or with the Books of Jonah and Daniel. The literary evidence for the supernormal there is simply insufficient.

It is curious to notice how, when we handle what are more or less contemporary documents in the Old Testament, such as the Books of Amos and Hosea, the miraculous is almost entirely absent: it seems only to make its appearance in those cases where time has been given for the imagination of religious thinkers to play around the stories of heroes of old time.

But does not this view of the Old Testament miracles rob the Old Testament of its power and its divineness? When the Book of God speaks of miraculous intervention, and you disallow this intervention, you are reducing God's word to the level of a human composition, and a somewhat unreliable one at that. This might indeed be said with strong reason, were the Old Testament but one book, were it but the composition of a day, and were it composed with but one deliberate purpose, namely, the production of belief in certain methods of God's working. But what is the Old Testament? It is not a single book, it is a library of many books. It is not the product of a day, it represents the growth of centuries. From the human point of view, it is a collection of fragments, which have grown together, not under the influence of any one presiding editor, but by reason of their native homogeneity. This accretion-process was not directed by any theological policy; it was due to the silent action of the religious life of a nation, which treasures the memorials of its past. And when this nation is the Jewish nation, whose history (in spite of all deductions on literary grounds) is plainly stamped as shaped by the special constraint of Providence, and whose prophets heard the voice of God speaking as no others of their age heard it, is it to be wondered at if the religious consciousness of this nation reflects itself spontaneously in its literature?

The story of the nation and its heroes is told over in the homes. It is pondered in private, it is expounded and amplified in public. Expansions and embellishments gradually attach themselves to the story as it is handed on: the religious experience of the people finds expression in tales of wonderful works, which the fathers tell the children, and which their faith in God, childlike and full of wonder, has no hesitation in crediting. And gradually, without any conscious intention, the new is incorporated with the old, and legend becomes indistinguishable from history.

And God is able to use this collection of national memorials for making men wise unto salvation through faith in Christ. How? Because it reflects the inspiration of His inspired people. What was it that threw back upon the records so much of this element of wonders and signs? It was their religious experience, which could only attribute to God supernatural power because of their rooted and well-justified belief in Him. The religious experience which pondered over the nation's history and elaborated it all unconsciously is a fact, and the Old Testament exists far more to reflect and register that solid spiritual fact and to commend it to us for our spiritual support, than to speak to us of miracles in the physical world.

Treat the Old Testament as a mirror, a mirror reflecting a national religious experience, a mirror reflecting the religious ideas held by the people which were spontaneously thrown back upon the records that came down the years with the people, and which were only thrown back upon the records because those ideas were so living and real to the people itself; treat the Old Testament as a mirror of the nation's religious experience, and you have a position from which you can approach the Old Testament to indefeasible spiritual profit. For then, the thing you look for is not bald history, but the marvellous religious faith which colours and heightens all it touches.

You tell me you like facts, that you distrust history which contains events that possibly never happened. But I ask you, is not religious experience a fact? Was it any other kind of fact that caused the Old Testament to come into being, and that makes it to be the book that it is? Is not the vitalizing and unifying thread that runs through its series of fragments the faith of the successive generations of the Hebrews? Is not this faith the constitutive fact of the Old Testament? and, by its side, are not the items of a miraculous kind incidental and secondary? We need to learn to weigh the values of facts: the faith of the Hebrews is as much greater than the miracle-narratives in which that faith at times

reflects itself, as the lighthouse beam that pierces the night is greater than the mechanism of the lighthouse lamp.

If we remember this, the Old Testament can be to us once more a book of Divine truth. We shall be able to get back once again to the simplicity with which the Apostles used it. They knew nothing of criticism, nor did they need to know anything. The Old Testament was to them a book of spiritual experience, revealing the very heart of the ancient people of God. It was a spiritual book framed around a history. Its object was for them not so much information as edification: its purpose was not so much history as a religious interpretation of history. What was written, was written for their admonition. And so every individual in it represented a type of character, every event in it impressed its own lesson; and the lesson was true, equally true whether the narrative were historical fact or idealization. For what counts is the truth suggested through the narrative. Parable can convey truth as surely as history can. We don't ask if Macbeth or Faust are reproductions point by point of historical fact. And our Lord Himself by His use of parable showed that He recognized the value of truth embodied in a tale. Has the story of His temptation anything the less to teach us, if we view it as a symbolic apologue, than if we treat it as a record of three successive concrete experiences? And so with the Old Testament. The less we talk about Biblical criticism, we who have to teach from the Bible, the better. Criticism is pedantic, dry, analytical. But it has one great lesson for us, and that is that the Bible is literature, *Eastern* literature: and if we learn that lesson, we shall turn from the worship of the letter to the search for the spirit.

The letter kills, but the spirit gives life. And when we exercise faith, the faith in Christ Jesus that St. Paul speaks of in the text, then it is that the Old Testament can make us wise unto salvation. And by 'faith' he does not mean the obstinate irrationality which persists in saying, 'Whatever criticism may teach, I am going to adhere to my belief that all the miracles happened exactly as they are said to have done'—by 'faith' he means the spiritual vision which has no time to waste on such irrelevant questions, but pierces down (as did Christ and the Apostles) below the circumstance to the truth, through the husk to the kernel, behind the form of the book to its purpose. 'Faith' tracks down the broad principles, seeks out the religious ideas, and finds itself quite unharassed by such questions as, 'Did Balaam's ass speak?' 'Did the whale swallow Jonah?'

I might conclude what I have to say by a reference to the latter incident. Educated men can hardly speak of Jonah now without self-consciousness. They feel that if they speak of Jonah they are committing themselves to a profession of belief in the literal historicity of the whole story. And as they don't believe in it, the less said about Jonah the better.

Now this is a very unfortunate attitude. There is hardly a finer piece of Christianity in the Old Testament than the teaching of the Book of Jonah, and very few people have the least idea that it is there. Jonah is a sealed book: people are frightened by the whale.

But let us view the matter in the light I have been suggesting, and let us fearlessly acknowledge that the Book of Jonah is a dramatic composition, and that the whale is not the story, but the least important part of it, merely part of the furnishing of the stage; and we may recover for our spiritual use one of the most striking lessons in broad-hearted philanthropy in the Bible, fit to stand by the Parable of the Good Samaritan or of the Prodigal Son.

Jonah is called to go and preach to heathen Nineveh, but as a Jew he resents this opening of the heart of God to the non-Jew. He flees from the duty; and in the great storm we see punishment following him, and in the whale we see the instrument of God's deliverance of Jonah from the extremity of punishment. The solitary importance of the 'great fish that God prepared' is as representing God's care pursuing Jonah in his sin, and saving him from himself. We get an illustration of our slavery to the letter when with prosaic clumsiness we let the whale suggest to us the miraculous, instead of (what poetically it stands for) the Divine care.

And here, for most people, the story of Jonah ends: but it has only just begun. Jonah is saved from his narrow ungenerousness, and is once again sent on his mission to heathen Nineveh. This time he goes, and he preaches, and heathen Nineveh repents. But he is still the old hard-hearted Jew; like Pharisees of a later day he rebukes God in his heart for His regard for the

outcast and the sinner. So he sits down and sulks. And the last chapter of Jonah gives us the picture of the prophet, being sheltered by a gourd which grows up to hide him from the heat, and displaying his pitying indignation over its sudden destruction by a worm.

The prophet protests that he does well to be angry over this piece of ruthless destruction: and the story finds its climax in the last words of the book: 'Thou hast had pity on the gourd, which came up in a night, and perished in a night: and should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?'

The Book of Jonah is full of the impossible—many other impossible things beside the whale. But it is full of truth; its rebuke of religious jealousy and selfish particularism makes one thankful it is in the Old Testament in spite of all the silly jests for which the accessories of the story have made our religion the butt.

Jonah will serve to illustrate an important principle. The Old Testament is Eastern literature. Read it as Western history, and you will find yourself hard put to to defend it: read it as an Eastern vehicle of truth, existing not for itself but for the truth it conveys; read it for yourselves, and you will find it can indeed make you wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

The Idealist Reaction against Science.

By Principal the Rev. James Iverach, D.D., Aberdeen.

The Idealistic Reaction against Science, by Professor Aliotta, Royal University of Padua, has been translated by Agnes McCaskill, and published by Messrs. Macmillan (12s. net). The point of view of Professor Aliotta may be best described in his own words, as given in the preface: 'The line of thought adopted by me defends the rights of the scientific method and of natural reality against the facile denials of the Neo-Hegelians. Idealism, which came into vogue in Italy after the decline of positivism, now appears to be on the wane, and the abuse of the dialectic method has resulted in such a confusion of ideas in mental science that Croce himself recently lifted his voice against these exaggerations. It is now time to return to realism, and in England, America, and Germany there are already indications of such a return, which this work of mine would fain hasten in Italy, where, if absolute idealism has attained a large measure of success, other vigorous and original currents of thought, which have disputed the victory with it, are by no means lacking.' The excellent translation by Miss McCaskill has enabled us to read this book, and has placed us on a level with the Italian reader. We are glad that the translation, so competent in every way, has appeared. For it is a notable addition to our philosophic literature. It is sure to be closely studied, and it deserves the closest study. In view of the large place which Idealism holds in contemporary literature, and of the place which it holds in our University teaching, it is well that a treatise on the scale of the present one, and a treatise of the conspicuous learning and ability which mark the work of Professor Aliotta, should be in the hands of the British reader. It is well also that we in these islands should be made aware of the philosophic work which is being done in Italy. Thanks to Dr. Ainslie, we have become acquainted with Croce, and here we have another Italian of high merit brought within our reach. All students will welcome this notable work in its English dress.

As we read and ponder over the contents of the volume, the first thing that strikes us is the wide learning and voluminous reading of the author. Many philosophers are well read in philosophical literature, and are not well equipped in science or in literature. Many of them too are limited in their reading to one or two languages. But Professor Aliotta is as well read in the literature of science as he is in philosophy. He is also acquainted with the whole range of contemporary literature, and the works of the great contemporary writers in philosophy and science are known to him, whether they have written in Italian, in

German, in French, or in English. He has given particular attention to the works of philosophers of all schools, and, what is unusual, he has dealt in detail with the new theories of mathematics and physics. It is not often that one reads a book of so wide a range, and so precise and accurate in all that it touches. It has not been our good fortune to meet such a book since we read Merz's *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. No doubt Merz is historical and expository, and Aliotta is expository and critical, but both writers are like in the wide range of their knowledge, and in the accuracy of their delineation.

After an introductory chapter in which he sets forth the reaction from intellectualism in contemporary philosophy, and describes the history of intellectualism and anti-intellectualism in philosophy, and sets forth the causes of the present reaction against intellectualism, he proceeds to his main task. It consists of two main parts: in one he discusses in detail the reaction from intellectualism in the new theories of knowledge; in the other he discusses the new theories of Mathematics; and in conclusion he gives the outlines of a spiritualistic conception of the world. We hope that some day he will enlarge this conclusion into a separate treatise, and work it out in detail.

Returning to the first part, he divides it into two sections—the first of which sketches the beginnings of the reaction from intellectualism, and the second the reaction itself in its full-blown vigour. Agnostic Positivism is the movement in which Aliotta discerns the beginning of the reaction. He deals with the Ignorabimus of Du Bois-Reymond, and with the Unknowable of Spencer. Agnosticism is the inevitable consequence of the traditional mathematical method. The following sentence is worth quoting: 'Spencer's System with its theory of the Unknowable, appealing to a belief, a feeling beyond conception, with its doctrine of the evolutionary intuition of the universe, discrediting, as it does, the traditional mathematical attitude, and putting science at the service of biological adaptationalism not only pregnant with the crisis of scientific intellectualism, but unfolds the first germs of that reaction whose development we shall follow as it strives in various ways to escape from the difficult position in which agnosticism has placed it.' It is an interesting task to follow the development through the fascinating pages of Professor Aliotta. Unfortunately that is not possible in any reasonable notice. We can only indicate certain points in this evolution. Neo-Criticism, Voluntaryism, and the Primacy of Practical Reason is the title of the next chapter, and in it he deals with Lange, Helmholtz, Riehl, Wundt, and Von Hartmann. The statement of the positions taken by these and the criticism of them are admirable. But the interest grows when in the same chapter he deals with Fouillée, Paulsen, Nietzsche, Lotze, and specially with the phenomenalism of Renouvier. The criticism of these authors and of their schemes is as admirable as is the accurate knowledge of them, and the recognition of the place they fill in the history of thought. Empiro-Criticism is the next theme, and perhaps the most interesting part of it is that which deals with Hodgson and Kleinpeter. But British readers will eagerly turn to the following chapter, which deals with English Neo-Hegelianism. We have been rather proud of Hutchison Stirling, the Cairds, Green, to speak only of those who have gone before. But Stirling and the Cairds are scarcely mentioned, and the names which occur are those of Green, Bradley, and McTaggart. This chapter also we must pass by in comparative silence, for to deal with it adequately would take more space than can be granted to us. Only the reader must not neglect it, for it is important.

In the chapters on The Doctrine of Contingency and Intuitionism, on Anglo-American Pragmatism, and on the Philosophy of Values and the Historic Method, which constitute the second section, the author is in contact with living interests, and touches on the most living issues of speculative thought at the present time. Here we come into contact with names likes Boutroux, Bergson, Le Roy, and Duhem, names of living worth, and names which really live in these pages. The chapter on Pragmatism deals with such names as Pierce, James, Schiller, and Dewey, the foremost protagonists of Pragmatism; full justice is done to them, and the criticism of Pragmatism is virile and convincing. In dealing with the Philosophy of Values the chief names he deals with are those of Windelband, Münsterberg, Royce (well known in Aberdeen as a former Gifford Lecturer), and Ward, another of our Gifford Lecturers. The author is forward to acknowledge the eminence of these thinkers, and the value of their contributions to human thought, but in the interests of Realism he is constrained to dissent from their conclusions

and to criticise their methods. For it is a first principle with him that each individual has an existence and a meaning of his own, and that he is not merely a something in the consciousness of another. He insists, as much as Alice in Wonderland does, that each one is real, and not merely a thing in the Red King's dream. He cannot accept any view which would make an individual to be an item in the dream of another individual. Speaking of the view of Royce, he asks, 'Is the existence of other Egos dependent upon me? Assuredly not! Then if I think this existence may or may not be an external meaning with respect to my idea, are my friends, and those who are dearest to me, real only in so far as they satisfy MY desire? or do they rather exist in themselves in the intimacy of their consciousness, an intimacy which I cannot directly penetrate? Does *this existence of theirs in themselves* differ from my thought which takes it as its object or not? The idealist, finding himself in such a strait, takes refuge in the Universal Mind, a subterfuge which avails him nothing, since, even if the immanence in God of my thought and of the other consciousness thought by me be granted, my thought will still remain something distinct from the person I think. For instance, I conceive the reality of the individual named Royce, and even supposing my concept, and the consciousness of Royce to form part of one and the same spiritual life, my idea with its internal meaning on the one hand, and the subject Royce on the other, will nevertheless remain two distinct things which cannot be fused into one unless the consciousness of the great American philosophic be annihilated.'

Passing to the second part, which is called The New Theories of Mathematics and Physics, we find chapters on Non-Euclidean Geometry, on the New Logical Elaboration of Pure Mathematics, on Energetics, the New Qualitative Physics, and on the Theory of Models. We have read it with interest, and we think that the presentation of the views is fair and accurate, and we also think that the criticism of them is cogent and convincing. Perhaps the best thing for our purpose is to give the following extract as the outcome of this part of the treatise. It is valuable in many ways, but chiefly because it enables one to see how idealistic Realism may be. 'The scientific concept is something more than a mere summary of perceptions: it is not an *abridged experience*, but an *idealized experience*, and its fruitfulness lies in its ideal character. In respect to experience it is not an impoverishment but a raising of it to a higher power; it is experience purified and carried to its ideal limit in order that it may satisfy the demands of necessity and logical universality. All the truly rational laws and concepts of science possess this character of ideal limits, which experience can approach more and more closely in proportion as the required conditions are verified, but which neither are nor ever can be completely realized. Every scientific concept is therefore in itself an anticipation of the future: the stamp of universality imprinted on it by thought impels it to transcend past experience and foresee the future. Our thought does not rest content with merely making a more or less economical record of perceptions, but seeks its own ideal nature in these perceptions, creating concepts which correspond more and more nearly to that type of unity which is its supreme law. There is no danger of its becoming stationary or sterile, since, as we have already seen, the ideal of reason is never realized: hence the ceaseless effort of science to harmonize known laws in higher syntheses and to establish its sway more firmly over the future. The formulas of our scientific theories, although suggested by experience, always transcend it; they are not only the reflexion of the known, but also an effort to divine the unknown. Even in the most abstract theories this hypothetic element, the life of science and the fertile root of its progressive development, is never lacking. It matters little whether the hypothesis takes concrete form in images or is expressed in mathematical signs; in either case it is a system of concepts, and only excess nominalism can stop short at the external model, and attribute to it that productiveness which is rather to be found in the thought of him who constructs it and in the idea it expresses.' The quotation is long, but we felt that we could not shorten it, because it sets forth the part which, for this realist, thought plays in the scientific construction of experience. It has here a great practice, but in all its activity thought is shown to be controlled by reality.

This appears more fully in the concluding chapter, which is called Outlines of a Spiritual Conception of the World. We may not attempt to summarize what is, indeed, too condensed already to secure a more detailed exposition. It is most suggestive, and very profound, but each section of it demands more space, to do it justice, than we

can afford to give to the whole. Special attention may be called to the section on the Dialectical Dedication of the Categories, which he thinks to be illegitimate and impossible. We follow his exposition and criticism with satisfaction, but in the end, where he deals with questions which may be called theological, we hesitate and decline to follow without further reflexion. But with regard to the treatise as a whole, its competency, its accuracy, its incisiveness, and its fruitful suggestiveness make it a book which no student can afford to neglect.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

'He liked me.'

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Paisley.

'Among the sons of my father he liked me, to make me king over all Israel.'—1 Ch 28[4].

This is a homely phrase used only this once in our Bible. David, who never forgot his early days, and all through his life turned back specially to them on solemn and important occasions, tells in this passage how he was chosen to be king over Israel. Samuel had gone to his father's house, and there seven sons had passed before him, but not one of them was the chosen one. There remained the youngest, but it had not been thought worth while to call him from the fields, and yet when he was sent for it was found that he was the Lord's anointed. In some ways it is a misfortune to be the youngest. The rest of the family are long in believing that his judgment can be trusted, or his opinion worth considering. Who would have dreamed, the brothers would say, that our David would be chosen? And so David puts it in this simple and homely way, 'He liked me,' as he looks back to that day which meant so much for him.

It is a way of speaking we often use in common, familiar talk. I heard the remark made about a boy one day some years ago. He was the eldest among his brothers and sisters, and he had been sympathizing with a little sister who had fallen and got slightly hurt. He spoke in such a kindly way to her that one who observed it remarked afterwards, 'I like that boy.' I am sorry to say that, later on, when he became a medical student, he got into a bad set, began to think some foolish ways were manly, and brought grief to the heart of his parents. But I believe that he will grow out of that, and that his native good disposition will yet come to the front. David too did some grievous things, but the likeable came to the top at last, and he became a great and good man in his later years, with a ripe and mellowed character.

What was it about David that God liked? (1) In the first place, I think we might say that there was something attractive about his outward appearance. Like Saul before him, David's appearance was one that would be likely to win for him the homage of the people as their king. Even though Samuel said, 'Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart,' David was certainly not lacking in appearance. We are told of him that he was 'ruddy and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to.' That description suggests an attractive face and form, and no doubt it had its share in God's choice of him for the high position in which dignity and attractiveness of appearance would all the more readily, as in Saul's case, gain the respect and affection of the people.

We judge a good deal by outward appearance, though often enough what is within may not correspond. 'Look at this little chin of mine with the dimple in it,' says the heroine in a modern story. 'Though I had a knowledge of all things under the sun, and the wisdom to use it, and the deep loving heart of an angel, it would not stead me through life like this little chin.' Dimples may be more than dowries. And yet, after all, how little it is in the long companionship of life! In the long run we, too, look not on the outward appearance, but on the heart.

Oh sunset of the withered cheek
And of the careworn brow,
Oh sunset of the steadfast heart,
How beautiful art thou!

Frances Willard was distressed when a girl at school because she was not better looking. Her mother tried to comfort her by quoting to her, 'The mind hath features as the body hath.' Her father would say, 'Handsome is that handsome does'; and her brother said, 'Never mind, Frank, if you aren't the handsomest girl in the school, I hear them say you are the smartest.' She took for her motto Socrates' prayer, 'Make me beautiful within.' And beautiful without, it might be said, she came to be also. As the years passed, her good heart showed itself more and more in her face. And when, at fifty years of age, she wrote the story of her life, she called it 'My happy half-century.'

(2) But, above all, it was the inward that God looked to in David. There was something in him, 'some good thing,' something promising, that led God to choose him to be king over Israel. Children are said to be good judges of character, to know those who really love them as compared with those who merely put on and pretend. There may be some truth in that, yet children often make great mistakes and fail to appreciate what is worthy of respect.

There are not many sayings of children in the Bible, and one of the few is a very unpleasant one, where we read of the children mocking Elisha, and crying, 'Go up, thou bald head!' It is the only thing we know of Elisha's appearance. He was different from Elijah, who is referred to as 'an hairy man.' Children would stand in awe of Elijah because of his appearance. Baldness was not common among the Jews, and was looked on as a kind of disgrace. No one who was bald was allowed to be a priest. If that were a rule in the modern ministry, a big number would be excluded. You may have heard of the foreigner who was addressing the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, and who began by saying that as he looked around he was struck by the number of *barren* heads before him.

But how did the case stand with Elisha? He was held in high esteem by those who knew his character. Elijah regarded him as the one best fitted to carry on his work. The sons of the prophets accepted him as the true successor of Elijah. And on his death-bed at last, the king said of him, 'My father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof!' Yet these children had no conception of the greatness and goodness of the man, but were simply amused by his appearance. There was one little girl, however, who would not have joined with this crowd—the little maid who waited on Naaman's wife. May you all be wise enough to respect character and worth in whatsoever outward guise they may appear. And by and by, when you grow up, may you yourselves have a character and worth such as shall gain the respect of those who come after you.

(3) Lastly, note the difference between liking and loving. There is a distinction. In that great verse in St. John's Gospel, beginning—'God so loved the world,' we could hardly alter it and read, God so liked the world. To like means that there is something attractive, something likeable. God's love is for us even when there is no beauty in us, but God's liking means something fine, something of promise, in the character. George MacDonald has said, 'To be trusted is a greater compliment than to be loved.' Even the most worthless human being may yet have some one who loves him. If his mother is alive, that is likely true. She loves him even though she may have learned from sad experience that she cannot trust him. She loves him when it could hardly be said that she likes him.

A good deal has been written about friendship, from Cicero downwards, but perhaps the question, Who is my best friend? was never more happily answered than by the boy who wrote, in a school examination, 'My best friend is one who knows me and yet likes me.' Jesus loves you, and He wishes to like you as well. His love will never fail, but may there be something, too, about you, and more and more as life goes on, that He likes, even as God liked David. And there is no saying what you also may yet be called to, and chosen for, in the Providence of God.

II.

May.

'This month shall be unto you the beginning of months.' —Ex 12^2.

The first of May—May-day! I wonder if you boys and girls like the sound of that word 'May-day' as well as some of us older people do.

We like it because the May-days of long ago seem very beautiful to us now. I remember one specially, as it was spent by a quaint little girl of seven years old. She had rather a dull home. Her father was a very strict man, and her mother

never thought of playing with her little boy and girl. But Louie woke very, very happy on May-day morning. 'Lou-ie, Lou-ie!' she heard her mother calling, 'it is six o'clock; rise and wash your face with the May dew.' Louie jumped out of bed very willingly indeed, for she remembered—how could she forget it?—she had been chosen to be the May Queen. Her crown of sweet spring flowers was ready. It lay covered up on the top of a chest of drawers in her room. She was a clever little girl, and had learnt quite a number of pieces of poetry. You will scarcely believe it, but as she dressed herself she kept reciting in a childish voice:

'You have waked and called me early, called me early, mother dear;
This is *the* most lovely day of all the glad new year;
Of all the glad new year, mother, the maddest, merriest day;
For I'm to be queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be queen o' the May.'

As soon as she was dressed, she trotted out to the garden, and gathering the dew from the grass, wiped her face all over with it. 'Heckie!' she asked softly, for her wee brother had followed her, 'is my face beautiful?' 'Yes, Louie; yes, it's like—it's like one of the little angels in father's big, big Bible.' Later, dressed in a simple white frock, and wearing a crown of spring flowers, she walked in front of a long procession of school children. Her king was a little fellow whose first name was 'Phelim,' and her maids were girls very much bigger than herself. They kept saying, 'Walk faster, walk faster'; but Louie was too happy to mind; for although 'Phelim' did not speak to her, he wore a crown like a real king's crown, and it was made of golden lilies. The walk ended in marching round part of a fine old garden, curtseying as they passed an old lady — the gentle duchess who owned the place—and then viewing a collection of work that was ready to be sent to a missionary somewhere.

'Mother, I was very, very happy,' Louie said afterwards (little girls did not use the word "*awfully*" then); 'I won't dirty my dresses any more.'

The few of those children who are alive now, are elderly men and women. Just about a year ago, I had a letter from the little May Queen. 'I can almost smell the flowers,' she wrote, 'the flowers that formed our crown on that May morning, long, long ago.'

My boys and girls, the May dew, and the spring flowers are still here. In Edinburgh, as early as six o'clock on the first of May, one can see numbers of young people toiling up 'Arthur's Seat' to wash their faces with dew from its grassy slopes, or its summit.

The idea that the fresh dew of a May morning can make our faces beautiful is an old-fashioned one. But some of us like it. It makes us think backward. Better still, our thoughts go forward too—away to the beauty that is spoken of in the Bible, the beauty that comes from being in God's presence. A long procession of boys and girls with faces shining from having pure and good hearts, passes before our eyes, shedding happiness on its way. I once heard an American lady professor say that she had often got an uplift from hearing of her old pupils. 'The girls generally marry,' she said; 'they settle perhaps in a little country place at first; then move on to something bigger. I have sometimes followed on their trail,' she added, 'and all the way felt as if some one who was good had been there before me.'

The little girls present, I feel sure, want me to say something about beautiful faces. The Bible is full of stories about beautiful people. They had the beauty that comes from doing kind actions, from being true, from having noble thoughts. A little girl was one day reading the Bible, and she came upon some verses that spoke of heaven. 'Grandpa,' she said, 'my Bible says that those who are in heaven shall never hunger or thirst. I understand that; but it says that "*His name shall be in their foreheads.*" What does that mean, grandpa? Who will write the name of Jesus on their foreheads?'

'Why they will write it themselves, of course, girlie.'

'Write it *themselves*, grandpa! but how?'

'Why, Margery, we are every day writing the names of our masters on our foreheads. Some people make a sad mistake and serve sin, and sin stamps its seal upon their faces. Some serve care, and care brands their foreheads with deep wrinkles. But those who love the Lord Jesus, Margery, and walk with Him, and do His will, write the name of their dear Master on their foreheads. They cannot help it.'

And Margery looked up wonderingly into her grandfather's face. She glanced at the grey hair that like a crown of glory circled the old man's

brow. She noticed more than that: she looked into his eyes. He had a beautifully expressive face. Margery had solved the problem of the name in the forehead. She flung her arms round the old man's neck, and cried, 'I think I understand now, grandpa.'

That is a little American story I read the other day.

And let me tell you something else that is very interesting. An eminent London photographer wrote an article for a learned paper. In the course of it, he said that 'one of the best evidences for religion is the type of face that the religious life produces.' '*His name shall be in their foreheads.*' To the Israelites, this '*Beginning of months*' was to be the memory of a great deliverance. To you, my boys and girls, a May morning may be the same. Little Louie said to her mother that she felt she would never want to dirty her dresses any more. Getting into God's presence is like bathing your face with dew. It will give you such a feeling of happiness, that you will never want to do a mean action. You will always want to be true, and you will be constantly trying to make everybody round you as happy as you are yourself. Pray to God about this to-night.

III.

One of the difficulties of preaching children's sermons is that children are of many ages. The Rev. Alfred J. Costain, M.A., solves the difficulty by making his addresses 'Straight Talks to Boys,' whom (and his book) he calls *Men in the Making* (Kelly; 1s. 6d. net). The addresses are all short as well as straight. This is one of them.

The Call of Christ.

Have you ever heard of General Armstrong? One of the most remarkable of the many great men that America has produced. When he began his work for the negroes in Virginia, he wrote to a friend: 'If you care to sail into a good hearty battle, where there is no scratching and pin-sticking, but great guns and heavy shot only used, come here. If you care to lend a hand where a good cause is shorthanded, come here.'

There you have the call to the heroic that is in us, and in all ages, this is not only the call of Armstrong or of Garibaldi—it is the call of Christ.

There are plenty of people in the world who are on the look out for a 'soft job.' They rarely seem able to get one, but it is their aim. But I fancy in most of us there is, deep down in our hearts, a conviction that that is not what we were put here in the world for. There aren't over many heroes in the world, but there's the making of a hero in most of us. Some great crisis or danger arises, and the most unlikely men leap into the fray. The call reaches them; it finds an echo in their hearts; they find themselves in the hour of need. What a chance the war has meant to many! How many who were missing their way in life have found their way to 'the front.'

War—with all its horrors—breeds heroes. It makes men. And I want you to hear the call to battle. What is wanted, said the philosopher of our day, is 'a moral equivalent for war.' Well, we have it. There is an eternal war, a holy war. The strong Son of God is ever leading forth the host of those who are ready to do battle with evil the world over. He offers 'hunger, thirst, forced marches, death'; but He also offers a prize, and it is manhood. You will win your soul. You will find yourself.

Fight the good fight with all thy might;
Christ is thy Strength, and Christ thy Right:
Lay hold on life, and it shall be
Thy joy and crown eternally.

Chinese Sidelights upon Scripture Passages.

By the Rev. W. Arthur Cornaby, Wusueh, China.

IV.

Patriarchal Childhood.—Continuing our study of China's ancient religion, we find that from the beginning of the Chou dynasty (1122 B.C.), when the prestige of the various duchies or marquisates (known as the *Divided Realms*) soon began to eclipse that of the royal domain (situate in the centre, and thus called *Central Realm*), the sacrificial worship of Shang Ti ('Sovereign Above' or Most-High God) became the exclusive prerogative of the sovereign, in his Divinely ordained capacity of 'Son of Heaven.' So much so, indeed, that when the newly appointed marquis of the western state of Ch'in,[1] after the removal of the capital from

[1] It is from the name of this ancient State that we have gained the word 'China,' by a process similar to that by which we have called the land of the Hebrews 'Palestine'—

that region to Ch'ang-an (the modern Si-an in Shensi), 'offered sacrifice to Shang Ti on the (old) altar,' in the year 770 B.C., the act was severely ensured. China's great historian, Ssu-ma Ch'ienc (b. *cir.* 145 B.C.), says:

> 'The chieftain of Ch'in had only lately been recognized as a marquis, and for him to worship Shang Ti was manifest arrogance. Such worship belonged only to the Son of Heaven; it was the secondary sacrificial worship of (the spirits of) notable hills and rivers that pertained to the various (dukes and) marquises. The act of the chieftain of Ch'in was barbarous. It was a violent crime. It was the primary spoliation of goodness and right for after generations.'

Again, in the year 253 B.C., when 'the prince of Ch'in presented himself before Shang Ti at Yung' (in modern Shensi), another historian says that the act was one of 'most flagrant arrogance.'

From a wider point of view we might have imagined the censure to have fallen rather on the sovereign for claiming a monopoly of such worship. For, although the earliest sacrificial worship of the Most High that is recorded in the Chinese Annals is represented as a regal act, the ancient 'sovereigns' prior to 2205 B.C., are regarded by the best modern Chinese writers as chieftains rather than 'sovereigns.' Moreover, nearly all the actual worshippers of Shang Ti mentioned (with favourable reference) in the old classics edited by Confucius, were certainly local chieftains, not 'sovereigns'—although one of them became such afterwards by force of arms.

We have only to go back in imagination, then, to the time—clearly indicated by the patriarchal character of Chinese imperial government—when the Chinese were a pastoral race (as their written characters represent them to have been[1]) under actual patriarchs, to find such patriarchs normally regarded as sacrificial worshippers of Shang Ti, each on behalf of his clan or family.

This consideration brings us into touch with the priesthood of Jethro and Job (1^5), as well as that of Melchizedek. It helps to explain also the coveted 'birthright' of the eldest son in the generations immediately following Abraham. That 'birthright' was 'profanely' rejected (Heb 11^{16}) by Esau; and when given to Joseph (1 Ch 5^2, 'the birthright was Joseph's') its outward and visible sign was 'a long robe with sleeves' (Gn 37^3, R.V. marg.), as any priestly dress would require to have been in China.

Among the Hebrews, for the ceremonial preservation of the worship of God, this patriarchal priesthood was merged awhile in the more rigid office of the Levitical priesthood, with various safeguards against a monopoly of the general privilege of worship; it reappeared (from the prophetic point of view) as the office of the nation as a whole (Is 61^6); it was eventually rejected by the nation (Ro 9–10), but ideally invested in Christ, with Himself as oblation (Heb 1–10), and more generally in those 'loosed from their sins by his blood' (Rev 1^{5-6}).

It is a striking fact that the patriarchal priesthood of the rulers of China (whether Chinese, Mongol, or Manchu), which can be traced back beyond the days of Melchizedek, was not discontinued until 1911,[2] by which time the Cross had been accepted (and adopted in the form of the 'red cross') throughout the Far East as the symbol of infinite benevolence; the priesthood of Christ proclaimed, and prayers and intercessions offered to Shang Ti by Christians in every large city in China. Indeed, in April 1913, those Christians in every city were officially requested by the Cabinet to fill the void left by the discontinuance of imperial intercession, by their united intercessions with Shang Ti for the nation at large—such being the inner explanation of a non-Christian government's appeal for Christian prayer.

WORSHIP.—Our modern word *worship*, so commonly used in the sense 'to adore as divine,' has intrinsically (like some Hebrew and Greek words which it represents in the Scriptures) a wide range of meaning. It is represented by twenty-five

it being the westernmost part of the land, as Philistia was of Canaan.

The Hebrews quoted it as *Sinim*, the Greeks as *Thina* and *Sina* (the first explicit notice of Thina is by Eratosthenes, b. 276 B.C.), from which our modern word *China* came to us through the Portuguese. After its long Western wanderings, the word has at last been re-introduced into the Chinese language by Japanese writers as *Chih-na*, and adopted in Chinese journalism as 'the Western name for our *Central Realm*.'

[1] *Righteousness* is formed of the signs *sheep* and *sheep*, *i.e.* recognition of my property. *Officials* (in old time) were written down as *pastors*, from *ox* and *striker*. Etc. etc.

[2] The last imperial sacrifice with intercessory prayer to Shang Ti was offered at the 'Altar of Heaven' in Peking at the autumn equinox of 1911, prior to the Revolution.

words in the current literary language of China, twenty-one of which are of sacrificial significance, two others meaning simple prayer, and the remaining two (*a*) 'respect' or 'reverence' and (*b*) 'an act or attitude of respect or reverence.'

1. *Religious Worship.*—To the question of Micah: 'Wherewith shall I . . . bow myself before the high God?' the answer in ancient China was very like the words: 'With . . . offerings, with calves of a year old.' A young ox was essential to the ceremony. And for the lesser worship of hill and river spirits by subordinate rulers (after the regal monopoly of the highest worship) a sheep was necessary for the occasion. All statedly religious worship, whether of a higher or lower order, was accompanied by the offering of sacrificial victims.

The meaning of these was 'propitiatory,' in the broad sense of the word, as gifts might be when offered to rulers or local governors (cf. Mal 1^{8}) whose favour and aid was desired.

Any 'worship' whatever in which there was no sacrificial offering ceased to be a religious act, and the object of such 'worship' was regarded as void of superhuman sacredness. This point of view is set forth in the following narrative, taken from two historical works of the Han dynasty, from which the shorter Annals were compiled:

> 'In the reign of *Han* Wu Ti (140–87 B.C., more than 150 years before the commonly-quoted "first introduction of Buddhism into China") a large army was sent into Mid Asia to conquer certain "barbarian" realms from which no tribute had been received. The two kings of those regions agreed to submit. But one of them, Hsiu-t'o by name, repenting of his decision, was slain by the other, who brought the treasures of both realms, as propitiatory offerings, to the *Han* general.
>
> 'From the realm of Hsiu-t'o was brought a golden image of Buddha, more than ten feet in height; and with it as hostages the son of the slain king and his retinue. The young "barbarian" prince was of majestic bearing; he gained the grace of the emperor, who appointed him equerry-in-chief. In spite of the remonstrances of his statesmen, the emperor caused the golden image to be honourably set up in the palace, and installed the young prince as instructor in its worship. Thereupon the statesman remonstrated again, saying: "The attendants of the golden *man* do not use oxen or sheep in sacrifice, but merely burn incense, ceremonially bowing (before it)." But the emperor would not listen to them. And thus Buddhism began to be introduced into China.'

Since the year 1900, Chinese Buddhist and Taoist temples have, in increasing numbers, been turned into public schools (and the idols cleared out and destroyed), for the avowed reason that those two cults have ceased to have any religious significance, being simply a means of gain to the ill-famed monks and nuns in charge,[1] and of supposed gain (of a strictly material order) to their votaries—many of whom will now, from the progress of education itself, be able actually to secure the precise gains which they once vainly sought by the offering of incense in the discarded temples.

In like manner, we may note that the worship of God Himself had, among a section of Hebrew worshippers, 'ceased to have any religious significance' in the times represented by such passages as Jer 44^{18} and Mal 3^{14}.

2. *Non-religious Worship.*—To a modern Western reader, the narrative of Abraham's reception of the 'three men' (who are called 'the Lord' and 'two angels' Gn $18–19^{1-15}$) seems to suggest that, from the first, he recognized his visitors to be more than human. An Asiatic would not read it thus. For, in reality, the 'bowing down to the earth' and the epithet 'lord' had as little religious significance as similar actions and words have had in China, when addressed to the writer, for instance, by humble non-Christian visitors at New Year's time, or by beggars at the roadside generally. With various polite essentials of Oriental guest-receiving, preserved in China until recent years (such as *chieh*, 'going forth to greet,' and *sung*, 'convoying on the way,' and depreciating words concerning available refreshment), Abraham 'shewed much worship' to his visitors, in the old English sense of the phrase, as used in Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*.

In like manner Joseph's brethren worshipped the (then) unknown governor of Egypt, and doubtless Jacob worshipped Pharaoh,[2] although the

[1] In the Chinese language no such phrase as Buddhist or Taoist *priest* occurs.

[2] Adding a singularly Oriental depreciation of his 'honourable age.' Over against 'few and evil have been the days of the years of my life,' a quantitative depreciation, there is the common Chinese qualitative depreciation: '(I have) emptily passed seventy' or 'eighty years.'

word is not mentioned, as it is in Is 49^{7} and Dn 2^{46}.

In the last passage (an exceedingly interesting one) we should say in Chinese that Nebuchadnezzar 'worshipped Daniel as Prime Minister.' And in that fact, and a Chinese incident about to be related, we gain much light upon the third temptation of our Lord (the third according to St. Matthew), which to modern Western minds seems to contain the utterly impossible meaning that Jesus should yield divine honours to the devil!

> 'During the "Divided Realms" period of the Chou dynasty, when the dukes and marquises of the various States were mostly independent of the central authority (of the literally "central realm"), and were becoming kings in all but name, the young Duke Huan of the northern State of Ch'i, in the year 684 B.C., sought for a wise man as counsellor. One Kuan I-wu had been opposed to him, and was regarded as his enemy. But was possessed of such diplomatic skill and experience that, yielding to persuasion, the young Duke Huan, finding no other so suitable, "accordingly worshipped him as prime minister," and adopting his methods, became great in the land.'

Thus illustrated, the third temptation was a truly insidious one. It was not that Jesus should yield up one iota of His divine status, or of His divine commission. It may have been simply that He should adopt, in His sacred enterprise, methods which had proved fitting and successful in the non-sacred establishment of earthly realms: methods which, though ordinarily connected with satanic evil, might, under the sacred mastery of the Christ of God, be overruled for the best ultimate good.

It was such a temptation as this against which our Lord was proof, if His representatives on earth have not always been so. He was to win the human multitude without the isolation of unworldliness, waiving some of the strict demands of the spiritual, avoiding the lowliness of toilsome ministry, the risk of rejection, the tragic horrors of a seeming defeat. It was this temptation He hurled behind Him, choosing rather to suffer the 'sharpness of death,' and thus to 'open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.'

John Mark.

By Professor the Rev. S. J. Case, Ph.D., Chicago.

Mark is not a conspicuous figure in the extant records of the Apostolic Age. Apart from the title of the Gospel which bears his name, he is mentioned only ten times in the New Testament. In five instances he is called 'Mark' (Μάρκος [WH], but more correctly Μᾶρκος [Ac 15^{39}, Col 4^{10}, Philem ^{24}, 2 Ti 4^{11}, 1 P 5^{13})]; three times he is referred to as 'John whose surname was (or, who was called) Mark' (Ἰωάνου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου [Ac 12^{12}]; Ἰωάνην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μᾶρκον [Ac 12^{25}]; Ἰωάνην τὸν καλούμενον Μᾶρκον [Ac 15^{37}]); and on two occasions he is called simply 'John' (Ἰωάννην [Ac 13^{5}]; Ἰωάνης [Ac 13^{13}]). 'John' is a Jewish name, and 'Mark' (Marcus) is a Latin *praenomen* assumed in accordance with a custom familiar at that time. Similarly, Saul of Tarsus assumed the *cognomen* 'Paulus' (Ac 13^{9}; see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, pp. 181–186; Eng. tr., *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 313–317).

The New Testament statements about Mark are very brief. He is said to be the son of a certain Mary at whose house in Jerusalem Christians were assembled when Peter escaped from the prison into which he had been thrown by Herod Agrippa I. (Ac $12^{12ff.}$). Evidently this house was a familiar place of meeting, for Peter went directly there and the maid who tended the door immediately recognized his voice. Presumably Mark was at home during these days, and so found himself in association with early representatives of the new religious movement. He is next mentioned in connexion with the return of Barnabas and Saul after they had carried relief to Judea (Ac 12^{25}). Probably Mark remained with them in Antioch, whence he accompanied them on the so-called first missionary

journey. He is said to have been with them at Salamis serving as their 'attendant' (ὑπηρέτην [Ac 13⁵]), but at Perga he abandoned the expedition and returned to Jerusalem (Ac 13¹³). Nothing more is heard of him until Paul proposes a second missionary tour. In the meantime Mark has apparently come back to Antioch, and Barnabas wishes to take him along a second time. Paul's vigorous protest results in a split with Barnabas, who sets out with Mark, while Paul and Silas journey together (Ac 15³⁷⁻⁴¹). Mark's name does not appear again in Acts, but in the letter to Philemon (v.²⁴) he is included among those 'fellow-workers' (συνεργοί) who are helping Paul in the task of evangelization during his imprisonment. Also in Col 4¹⁰, of the two fellow-workers left to comfort Paul in his affliction, Mark is one. He is here said to be the cousin (ἀνεψιός) of Barnabas, and is commended to the Colossians as worthy of a cordial reception should he make a journey thither. In 2 Ti 4¹¹ Mark is no longer with Paul at Rome, but is somewhere in the East. Timothy is urged to come to Rome as quickly as possible, bringing along Mark, who is useful to Paul for ministering (εἰς διακονίαν). Finally, Mark is in 'Babylon' (ἐν Βαβυλῶνι), where he unites with Peter, who calls him his son (υἱός), in salutations to the readers of the Epistle (1 P 5¹³). In addition to these explicit statements, it has been conjectured that he was the water-carrier mentioned in Mk 14¹³ (Lk 22¹⁰), or that he was the young man who fled so hastily on the night of Jesus' arrest (Mk 14⁵¹ᶠ.; see Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Leipzig, 1900², ii. p. 212, n. 6; Eng. tr., *Introduction to the New Testament*, New York, 1909, ii. p. 446, n. 6). But these conjectures do not rise above the level of interesting possibilities. Much less can Hitzig's contention that John Mark is the John of Patmos who composed Rev. be taken seriously (Hitzig, *Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften*, Zürich, 1843; cf. Spitta, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Halle, 1889, who posits Markan authorship for one of the sources of Rev.).

Only a very meagre outline of Mark's career can be reconstructed from these New Testament data. He first appears upon the scene about the year 44 A.D. At that time he was living with his mother in Jerusalem, where he came into contact with representatives of the new religious movement. At some unknown date he espoused this cause later associating himself with Barnabas and Saul at Antioch and in their travels through Cyprus to Perga in Pamphylia. There he left them and returned home to Jerusalem, but later came again to Antioch. He would have gone with them upon a second trip had not Paul refused his company. Thereupon he became the travelling companion of his cousin Barnabas. Their further missionary labours are ignored by the author of Acts, but it seems highly probable that Barnabas continued to carry on aggressive evangelistic work (1 Co 9⁶). Probably Mark was similarly engaged, although no record has been made of his activities during these years. We have to content ourselves with a few hints suggesting that he was at one time with Paul in Rome, at another time in the East, and on still another occasion with Peter in 'Babylon' (*i.e.* Rome).

Several difficulties arise in any effort to interpret these scanty data. (1) When Barnabas and Saul were preaching in the Jewish synagogues of Salamis in Cyprus, Mark is said to have been their attendant (Ac 13⁵). But 'attendant' (ὑπηρέτης) is a term having various possible meanings. In the present connexion it is commonly taken to imply that Mark, while not serving as a menial (δοῦλος), was nevertheless mainly busied with minor duties in connexion with the journey—'arrangements for travel, the provision of food and lodging, conveying messages, negotiating interviews, and the like (Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1902,² p. xvi). He was not engaged in the actual work of preaching, but in rendering personal service to Barnabas and Saul. Others suggest that it fell to Mark to baptize the converts (*e.g.* Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, Göttingen, 1895, p. 146). Still others take 'attendant' as an official title (as in Lk 4²⁰) used to designate an individual whose duty it was to perform stated services in the synagogue. Once upon a time, so it is assumed, Mark had occupied this office, and henceforth he was known as 'John the synagogue attendant' (so F. H. Chase, article 'Mark (John),' Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii., Edinburgh, 1909, p. 245 f., reading εἶχον as equivalent to εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν). If a choice is to be made from among these conjectures, it is perhaps safer to follow the hint given in 2 Ti 4¹¹, to the effect that Mark is useful for ministering (εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν), and so to find in Acts a reference to Mark's general usefulness in connexion with the mission. Thus his rôle, in the eyes of the writer of Acts, is similar to that of Timothy, Titus, and

other helpers mentioned only incidentally in the New Testament.

(2) Whether Mark was so fully responsible for the breach between Paul and Barnabas, as the brief statement of Ac $15^{38f.}$ might imply, is also a question. One class of interpreters endeavours to justify Mark's abandonment of the first expedition on the grounds of expediency. He had not, it is said, been designated by the Holy Spirit for this work, he may not at the outset have known that the mission would extend to Asia, and home duties may have called him back to Jerusalem (see W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, New York, 1893, p. 61; Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 246). But may not the events recorded by Paul in Gal $2^{11ff.}$ shed some light on Mark's situation? According to this representation it was not the conduct of Mark, but that of Peter, which led to the break with Barnabas (Gal 2^{13}). The two incidents need not be mutually exclusive, but in any case the events at Antioch described in Gal. were in all probability earlier than those mentioned in Ac $15^{38f.}$, and the former incidents must have been an important preliminary to the latter. In Acts, Mark has been made —whether by design or by accident can only be conjectured—to bear the brunt of a burden which Paul is disposed to place chiefly upon Peter. It is not impossible, to be sure, that Mark was among 'the rest of the Jews' whose dissimulation helped to lead astray 'even Barnabas'; but Peter more immediately, and James ultimately, were, in Paul's judgment, chiefly responsible for this unfortunate turn of affairs (Gal $2^{11f.}$). At most, Barnabas' desire to take Mark upon the second journey was the climax, and not the primary cause, of his break with Paul.

(3) Later mention of Mark as one of Paul's most trusty helpers constitutes still another difficulty. It is a very sudden and harsh transition from the point where Mark is last mentioned in Acts (15^{39}), as being so objectionable to Paul, to the passage in Philemon (v.^{24}), where Mark's name is given first place among Paul's fellow-workers. The difficulty is only enhanced by the further statements in Col $4^{10f.}$ and 2 Ti 4^{11}, where it appears that Paul values Mark perhaps above any other of his companions, unless an exception be made in the case of Luke 'the beloved physician.' How did it come about that one who had been so distinctly *persona non grata* to Paul in earlier times could subsequently become his loyal supporter? There had been, of course, ample time for differences to be healed; but in view of what has been said above the breach between Mark and Paul may not even at the outset have been so wide as the brief statement in Ac $15^{37ff.}$ standing alone might seem to imply. One thing at least is certain, Mark ultimately became one of Paul's most valued helpers. This fact is sufficiently attested by Philem ^{24}, quite apart from any possible question about the authorship of Col. or 2 Timothy.

(4) This certainty regarding the friendship between Mark and Paul raises the problem of Mark's relations with Peter. Their acquaintance had doubtless begun in Jerusalem, but they are not found together again until we come to 1 P 5^{13}. Here Mark appears in filial association with Peter; and one wonders how his attachment could have been so close to both Paul and Peter, since these two individuals are commonly thought to represent rival tendencies within early Christianity. Among the different solutions proposed for this problem, the hypothesis of two Marks in the Apostolic Age is now quite generally rejected (see Schanz, *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Marcus*, Freiburg, 1881, p. 2. n. 1). The Tübingen School, which stresses the differences between Paul and Peter, doubts the genuineness of 1 P., making it the work of a tendency writer who for synthetic purposes transferred prominent companions of Paul, like Silvanus and Mark, into the company of Peter. Other interpreters make the gap between Paul and Peter less wide, so that the problem of adjustment becomes mainly a chronological and a geographical one. 'Babylon' is now generally taken to be a metaphorical expression for Rome, and as Mark was certainly there with Paul, so he may have rendered Peter similar service when that apostle visited the city. This whole question is bound up with other problems, such as the genuineness of the writings ascribed to Peter, his residence in Rome, and the dates at which he and Paul died. Since the discussion of these questions does not fall within the scope of the present article, we may simply note that Mark's association with Paul is much more strongly attested, so far as New Testament data go, than is his association with Peter.

In view of the scantiness and obscurity of the New Testament records, it is not surprising that early Christian tradition should have endeavoured to supply additional information about Mark. This interest was greatly stimulated by the fact that

the early Church was using a Gospel which, by common consent from an early date, was said to have been written by him. Even in the time of Papias this seems to have been a generally accepted opinion (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15). Accordingly lacunæ in the New Testament records were soon filled out with data regarding this evangelist's family connexions and personal characteristics, his association with Jesus and the apostles, his own activity, and the manner of his death. These traditions are rarely trustworthy, but they are of interest in showing the efforts of early Christians to enlarge upon the history of apostolic times. (1) The Vulgate preface to Mk., frequently referred to as the Monarchian Prologue, states that Mark had cut off his thumb to avoid the necessity of serving as a priest (see Wordsworth and White, *Nouum Testamentum Latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi*, ii. [Euangelium secundum Marcum], Oxford, 1891, p. 171; and Corssen, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien* [Texte und Untersuchungen, xv.], Leipzig, 1896, p. 9 f.); and in Hippolytus (*Philos.*, vii. 30 [Eng. tr., *Refut.* vii. 18]) he is called the 'stub-fingered' (κολοβοδάκτυλος). The exact meaning of Hippolytus' epithet is still in doubt, but possibly it also has reference to a supposed self-mutilation of Mark in order to avoid service as a priest. His kinship to Barnabas the Levite (Col 4^{10}, Ac 4^{36}) doubtless furnished the incentive for such tradition.

(2) Legend also gives Mark a definite place in the history of Jesus' career. According to one interpretation of the opening words of the Muratorian canon, it affirms Mark's association with Jesus. The fragment begins in the middle of a sentence thus: 'at some, however, he was present, and so recorded them' (*quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*). The writer apparently is speaking of Mark, hence 'at some' has been taken to mean on certain occasions in the ministry of Jesus. But more probably this language should be understood to mean that Mark was present on certain occasions when Peter preached and later recorded in the Gospel what he there heard. This is in agreement with the statement of Papias, that Mark 'neither heard the Lord nor did he follow him, but afterwards, as I said, (attended) Peter,' later writing down what he remembered of Peter's discourses (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15; cf. Tertullian, *adv. Marc*, iv. 5). Several later, but wholly unreliable, authorities place Mark among the 'Seventy' (see Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, ii. 2, Braunschweig, 1884, p. 328 f.).

(3) Tradition also enlarged upon Mark's association with the apostles, particularly with Peter. This was a natural development, considering the growing importance of the Roman Church with which Peter's name came to be so closely linked. The Monarchian Prologue says that Mark was baptized by Peter (*Petri in baptismate filius*), but this statement may be only an inference drawn from the expression 'my son' in 1 P 5^{13}. More importance is commonly attached to the numerous statements (cited fully by Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 321 f.) which make Mark the missionary companion of Peter from whom the chief content of the Gospel of Mark is said to be derived. The earliest of these witnesses is Papias, who, on the authority of 'the Elder' (John), says: 'Mark, becoming the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, but not, however, in order, so much as he remembered of the things said and the things done by Christ' (Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15). This is not the place to discuss the authorship of the Second Gospel; we are chiefly concerned with the expression 'interpreter of Peter' (ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου). This language ordinarily would mean that Peter knew only the Semitic speech and that Mark served as translator when they were among Greek-speaking peoples. Papias is usually so understood, but another meaning is possible. In a previous paragraph he has spoken of his own treatise expounding the discourses of the Lord as 'interpretations' (ἑρμηνείαις [Euseb., *H.E.*, iii. 39. 3]), and possibly he styled Mark 'interpreter' because the latter had embodied the substance of Peter's sermons in a written Gospel. Similarly, when Papias says that the Matthæan collection of the Lord's sayings originally written in 'Hebrew' were 'interpreted' according to individual ability (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15), he may have in mind expositions such as his own 'interpretation.' Indeed, it is not at all certain—some would say quite improbable—that he had so much as seen the 'Hebrew' collection of which he speaks, and certainly his treatise was not in the nature of a translation. His meaning is at best obscure, and similar remarks in other early writings are mostly if not wholly inspired by his statements; and his information, or that of his informant, may ultimately have sprung from the New Testament representation that Peter's affiliations at the outset

were emphatically Jewish and that in later times Mark served him as a 'son.'

(4) Mark is also credited with important independent activities, especially in Egypt, where he was the first to preach Christianity and found a Church in Alexandria. Eusebius (*H.E.*, ii. 16. 1) is authority for this information, which he may have derived from a late second century list of Alexandrian bishops. This he supplemented by his unjustified inference that the Therapeutæ, described in Philo's tractate *quod omnis probus liber*, must have been a company of Christians. Finally, in the late and wholly unhistorical Acts of Mark, the Evangelist is glorified as the first martyr of Alexandria (Lipsius, *op. cit.*, pp. 322–327 and 329 ff.).

Contributions and Comments.

Revelation xvi. 16.

I SHOULD much like to draw the attention of your readers to Rev 16^{16}, the prophecy of 'a great hail' that shall fall 'out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent'; and this in connexion with the Battle of Armageddon.

For many years I have in my own mind referred this prophecy to cannon-balls; for though these do not actually fall out of heaven, yet to persons exposed to them they may easily appear to do so. To bombs dropped from aeroplanes the description seems more appropriate. Ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is more accurately 'from the sky' than 'from heaven.'

Whether we are actually witnessing the Battle of Armageddon, we cannot say; but if that awful judgment is still reserved for some future generation, is it not highly probable that the art of aeronautics has a great development in store; and that its present exploits are but a preparation for an enormously greater fulfilment of this awful prophecy?

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

Corrigenda and Addenda in 'B.D.B.'

IN addition to the *Addenda et Corrigenda* printed at the end (pp. 1119–1127) of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon (conveniently known as *B.D.B.* from the names of its editors, Dr. Brown, Dr. Driver, Dr. Briggs), I have noticed the following. (As *Addenda* are often debatable points it seems well to make two separate lists, beginning with obvious *Corrigenda.*) Some are quite trivial; others are more important; but all seem worth noting.

I.

Page.	*Col.*	
266.	2.	Under II. זור Ib 19^{17} *read* לאשתי.
344.	1.	,, חפשׁ Niph. Ob^{6} *read* נחפשׂו.
371.	2.	,, טבור, *for* 'Ex' *read* 'Ez.'
401.	1.	Line 24, *for* 'e (4)' *read* '6 c.'
419.	1.	Under יעף adj., transpose עם in first exple.
431.	2.	Piel, *for* 'Impf.' *read* 'Pf.'
435.	1.	Line 1, Ges. ref. *read* § 76 (2) f.
498.	1.	*For* 'Niph.,' *read* 'Nithpl. (or as Hithp., cf. Driver *in loc.*).'
534.	1.	Line 15, Ges. ref., *for* 'Anm[8]' *read* 'ee.'
554.	2.	Line 6, *for* ח *read* ה.
620.	1.	Under נגר, 1, *for* 'מנרים' (Hoph.) *read* 'הַנְּגָרִים' (Niph.).
772.	4.	Under עֲנָב, line 3, ענבי, note that the Bomberg edition has עִנְּבֵי.
849.	1.	Line 14, *for* '566' *read* '596.'
857.	2.	Under צעד Qal-Inf. בְּצַעֲדֵךְ, note that Mass. Text points בְּצַעֲדֵךְ.
857.	2.	Third line from end, Isa ref. *read* '3^{21}.'
899.	2.	Under קרה Qal., third line, *for* וְיִקר *read* וַיִּקר.
903.	2.	Under קשׁקשׁה, third line, note that Mas. Text reads קַשְׁקַשִּׁים in passage cited.
908.	1.	Line 23 from end, *for* '1 S' *read* '2 S.'
961.	1.	Under שׁדי, 1, between '*field*' and 12^{12} insert 'ψ'; and between 'also' and 10^{4} insert 'Ho.'
966.	2.	Under שׁטן, third line, *for* לשׂטנו *read* לשִׂטנו.
1054.	1.	Line 10 from end, *for the* ד in first word *read* ה.
1075.	2.	Line 4, *for* ביחד *read* ביתד.

BIBLICAL ARAMAIC.

1081. 2. Under אנף, last line, *for* 'pl.' *read* 'du.'
1091. 1. Under זוע, *for* Qr זינין *read* זיעין.
1109. 2. Under אצבע, last word, *for* ע *read* עָת.
1114. 1. Under שׁכל, *for* 'Hithpe,' *read* 'Hithpa.'

II.

130. 2. Under בוצין, why not allude to the derivation proposed = *splendens*? Cf. Ges. *Thesaurus* quoted by H. P. Smith (*Samuel*, p. 106).
229. 2. Under הלא, cf. Kittel, Mi 4^7, who proposes הַנַּחֲלָה, while 'the versions seem to have read הנרחה, as in v.^{6}.'
461. 2. Under כר it should be pointed out that the word is *masc.* in 1 Ki 18^{34}.
561. 1. Under מוה, add the conjecture רֵוֵי (from רֵוֶה 'emaciated') given by Driver in Kittel.
623. 2. Under נדר there is, curiously, no mention of the Impf. וַיִּדַּר which occurs Gn 28^{20}, Num 21^2, Ju 11^{30}.
642. 2. Line 13 from end, add ref. to Ez 34^{29} for מ' לשם.
671. 2. Line 26, 1 Ch 14^2, the form נִשֵּׂאת here taken as ptc. might also be an exceptional Pf. Indeed, E. L. Curtis, *in loc.*, says it 'must be' so taken.
674. 2. Under נשה add cross ref. to שׁיה, p. 1009.
704. 1. סְעַפָּה. Why not link with שְׂעִפִּים, p. 972? May not the two words be really one? Cf. Burney on 1 Ki 18^{21}.
743. 2. Under עיט add ref. to 1 S 25^{14}.
866. 1. Under כב, why not give a familiar English equivalent? 'Near ½ gallon.'

BIBLICAL ARAMAIC.

1101. 2. Add ref. to verb נבא Hithpa. Ezr 5^1.
1115. 2. Add שְׁלְטוֹן, Dan $3^{2f.}$, with a ref. to BH, p. 1020.

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

King's and Queen's Colleges, London.

Acts xxvii. 17.

THE prevailing view as to the meaning of 'undergirding' a ship is that it refers to the practice, common in antiquity, of passing one or more cables under the hull and then fastening them tightly to prevent the timbers giving way in bad weather. This view is championed by James Smith in his well-known book *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, which is still the best authority on its subject (see pp. 107–109, 210–215 in 4th edition, 1880). Reference to the article on 'Ships and Boats' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, extra volume, and that on 'Ship' in *Encyclopædia Biblica* will show that support is still forthcoming for the alternative theory, which supposes the ropes to have been passed along the outside of the ship longitudinally. The usage of *βοηθείαις* to denote the cables does not seem to have received illustration. It may be a nautical term otherwise unknown, or Harnack's idea may be right, that a medical metaphor is to be postulated (see *Luke the Physician*, p. 181). There is authority for this use; see Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 273, whom Harnack is following here, but *prima facie* it would appear perverse to see medical phraseology in so distinctively nautical a passage.

Instances showing the use of the expedient of undergirding a ship—'frapping' is the technical English word—will be found in Smith's work, the latest being from the year 1837. It does not seem to have been noticed that a similar device has on occasion been employed to stop a hole in a ship. The reference is found in the account of Captain Cook's first voyage as described in Roderick Flanagan's *History of New South Wales* (quoted in *Early Days in Australia*, edited by Herbert Strang, pp. 106, 107). The ship had sprung a serious leak, and was making for the land.

'It was impossible, however, that the labour by which the pumps were worked could be continued for any length of time, and, as the exact situation of the leak could not be ascertained, there was no hope of stopping it within.

'While the captain was perplexed as to what course to follow in this emergency, a midshipman named Monkhouse proposed the adoption of an expedient which he had seen followed successfully under similar circumstances, in one of his voyages. The young man was entrusted with the direction of the process which was called "fothering," and was performed thus: To one side of a sail were loosely stitched handfuls of oakum and wool, chopped into fine pieces, and over this was plastered all the sheep-dung procurable on board.

This sail so prepared was then drawn under the bottom of the ship by means of ropes. When it came under the leak, the suction carried the material that had been stitched to the sail into the aperture, which thus became partially stopped. By these means the water was so far reduced, that while three pumps were previously necessary to keep it under, it was now readily checked by one.'

The ship got safely to the shore and the damage was repaired. Is it beyond the bounds of possibility that St. Luke's unusual word *βοηθείαις*—translated in the English versions in the only possible way, 'helps'—was suggested by the fact that some unusual method, not the ordinary process of undergirding, was employed? It should be remembered that James Smith finds the narrative of Acts inexplicable apart from the supposition that the ship had sprung a leak.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

Numbers xxii. 6.

The words אוּלַי אוּכַל נַכֶּה בּוֹ are usually regarded as an instance of the non-agreement of the main and auxiliary verbs in number. This non-agreement is explained by comparing Is 47^1, לֹא תוֹסִיפִי עוֹד יִקְרְאוּ לָךְ, or by regarding אוּכַל as a scribal error for נוּכַל, due to the proximity and influence of אוּלַי. The LXX has *δυνώμεθα*, *i.e.* נוּכַל. Rashi explains נכה by אני ועמי נכה, which solves the sense but not the grammar.

I venture to think that נכה represents the infinitive construct Pi'el, and that it is directly subordinated to the auxiliary verb, without the use of ל, a construction which is too well known to require comment. It will be urged—

(1) That the root נכה is used in the Hif'il and not in the Pi'el.

(2) That the form נַכֶּה would be strange even for נַכֵּה the inf. abs., while, as a matter of fact,

(3) The inf. const. (נְכוֹת) is desiderated.

But in reply to—

(1) The Pu'al occurs in Ex $9^{31.\ 32}$. If a Pu'al is found, a Pi'el cannot be impossible.

(2) The shortening of *çērē* to *seghōl* is the result of the loss of the tone, owing to the following monosyllable בּוֹ, joined to נכה by *Maqqēf*. Further, we find הַרְבֶּה for הַרְבֵּה in virtual pause (Jer 42^3).

(3) The forms of ל"ה infinitives vary considerably, and too much uniformity cannot be expected. But, in point of fact, Hos 6^9 (זִכְחֵי אִישׁ) furnishes an exact parallel for the use of the form גַּלֶּה for גַּלּוֹת, since the change of *he* to *yod* is merely orthographical (so Gesenius, § 75*aa*). In the Hif'il, הַרְבֵּה is used for the inf. const. in Ezk 21^{20}. Altogether ל"ה verbs display many varieties of form in their infinitives.

Finally, I see that Baer, in his concordance, places נַכֶּה in the Pi'el division, and that Ibn Ezra also regards it as an infinitive (שם הפעל), and for the *he* form, compares Dn 9^{24}, where his text seems to have read לְכַלֵּא for our לְכַלֵּה.

Herbert Loewe.

Exeter College, Oxford.

'House.'

I.

In reference to Rev. Harrington C. Lees' note on 'house' in the February Expository Times, I see that Davidson, in commenting on Zeph 1^8, 'king's children,' says, 'LXX reads "house."' The words 'children' and 'house' are occasionally confused. LXX reads 'house' where Heb. has 'children' in Jer 16^{15}, Ezk 2^3, 1 Ch 2^{10}; on the other hand it reads 'children' where Heb. has 'house' in Gn 45^{11}, Ex 16^{31}, Jos 17^{17} 18^5, Hos 17^{11}.

G. Herbert King.

Croydon.

II.

In reply to Rev. Harrington C. Lees may I be allowed to say that 'house' is a generic term commonly in use in the 'unchanging East' to describe a household, an establishment of which the man is the natural head. I remember the late Sir Richard Temple telling me more than thirty years ago that in India one never asked an Indian about his wife's health, but 'How is the house?'

Ch. Callow.

Golcar, Huddersfield.

The remaining Syriac Versions of the Gospels.

After having expressed in a succinct manner our opinion about the Lewisian Version and compared it successively with the Curetonian and the Diatessaron, it may be worth while to write some lines on each of the remaining Versions separately. By order of importance and not of date we meet first with the Version called *Pshitta*. A desideratum is justly felt everywhere for a critical edition of this Version, the four editions published at Mosul that I myself revised and corrected, and the edition of Urmi and that of New York being undertaken solely for practical purposes. A good essay towards a critical edition has recently seen the light in *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum* of Pusey and Gwilliam; and in spite of grave defects this edition marks the first step towards a final study of this Version. The task of preparing a serious publication would be difficult, because its text having been used in the Syrian Church from the end of the fourth century down to our own day, hundreds of useful and ancient manuscripts would have to be constantly perused.

History is dumb as to the origin of this Version. A well-known critic[1] tried to show in the last few years that Rabbūla, Bishop of Edessa (411–435), may be assumed to have been its exclusive author. The reason for this opinion is a passage found in the life of this saint written by a Monophysite, in which it is said that Rabbūla translated the New Testament from Greek into Syriac. This passage runs thus:

'And he translated by the wisdom of God which was in him, the New Testament, from Greek into Syriac, because of its variants, with accuracy, as it was.'[2]

Strictly speaking, we can draw no logical argument from this passage in favour of the Pshitta or of any other Version known to-day. The only point that we can hold with safety is that Rabbūla is credited by a Monophysite writer, some thirty to fifty years after his death, with a translation of the New Testament. The canons for priests and monks that Rabbūla himself had compiled, at the end of his life, contain nothing for the corroboration of his claim to being a Scriptural author: 'Let priests and deacons take care that in all churches a gospel of the separated (texts) should be found and read.'[3] This passage has clearly the condemnation of the Diatessaron in view, and cannot present any suggestion of a Version edited by Rabbūla.

About the first of these two passages we can even advance another step. A constant Syrian tradition represented by historians such as 'Amer ibn Matta[4] and Ebedjesu of Nisibis[5] attribute to Maraba, the Nestorian Patriarch of Seleucia, at the first half of the sixth century, a translation of the whole Bible from Greek into Syriac; but historical science cannot accept such a tradition without great reserve, and no serious man can sanction it without previously showing some real specimens or quotations from it. As a matter of fact, it is hardly conceivable that a translation undertaken by a man like Maraba would have left no trace in the Syro-Nestorian Church. Would it not be possible, *a pari*, to treat with the same discredit the tradition concerning Rabbūla? Arabists and Syrologues know, I think, how to treat information given by *traditionalists* with their unlimited hyperboles. Moreover, why has no Monophysite author ever referred to the Pshiṭta as Rabbūla's Version? Why was the humility of Rabbūla so great as to obliterate his name from the Scriptural annals of an 'Authorised Version' intended to exhibit a text accepted by all Syriac-speaking communities? The more pious monks of the sixth and the seventh centuries did not consider the example of Rabbūla worthy of their attention, and the Versions of Philoxenus and Thomas of Ḥarḳel are commonly known by the respective names of these two writers.

Another argument likely to weaken the statement of the Jacobite writer of the life of Rabbūla is found in a Syro-Oriental tradition preserved by Isho'dâd of Merw, in which it is said about the Epistle to the Romans:

'Mar Kūmī translated this Epistle from Greek into Syriac for Marī the presbyter, with the help of Daniel the presbyter, the Indian.'[6]

Though we do not attach more importance to

[1] Professor Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshé* (1904) and *S. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel* (1901).

[2] Bedjan's *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, iv. p. 410.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 457.

[4] *Maris, Amri et Slibæ Commentaria* (*pars altera*), edit. Gismondi, p. 41.

[5] Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, III. i. p. 75.

[6] M. D. Gibson's 'The Comment. of Isho'dâd' (in *Epist. ad Romanos*), p. 22.

this tradition than to that preserved in the life of Rabbūla, three points are at least clear: viz. that (*a*) the writers of the Syrian Church did not know exactly who was the author of the Pshiṭta of the New Testament; (*b*) that each community tried to show that it was prepared by men belonging to their own confession; (*c*) that, if the whole of it were elaborated by Rabbūla or by Kūmī (end of the sixth century), the Syrian historians ought to have known the fact, and have treated the Version accordingly.

On the other hand, that Rabbūla might be the author of a Syriac Version accepted as authentic by all the Syrian Churches is contradicted by the following fact. We know how deep were the animosity and hatred of the two Aramæan communities, the Nestorian and the Jacobite, to each other. Even in our day, the diversion of some members of both Churches to the Roman communion can by no means affect that animosity, and the members of one community are still sending their brothers belonging to the other community straight to hell. In the case of Rabbūla this animosity is to be accentuated in a far more emphatic manner. His open championship of the cause of Cyril of Alexandria, after some tergiversations towards Nestorius, had sharpened against him the teeth of all the Dyophysites. His existence at Edessa was very precarious. This hostile attitude is made manifest by the famous letter that Ibas, his successor in the episcopate, wrote, some three years after his death, to Mari the Persian bishop of Beith Ardashīr. In this letter, Rabbūla is called simply 'the tyrant of the city (of Edessa)'; 'the persecutor not only of the living, but also of the dead.'[1] These invectives are repeated more or less intensely by all Nestorian writers of a later date. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Nestorians would have accepted, in their Christological discussions, a Version translated or elaborated by so suspicious a man, their most deadly enemy? An affirmative answer to this question is very improbable.[2]

The second argument suggested for the right attribution of the Pshiṭta Version to Rabbūla is not irrefragable either. We are given to understand that the quotations from the Gospels made by the ancient Syrian Fathers do not agree with the Pshiṭta, but with what it has been a custom to call the *Old Syriac* Versions. The Syrian Fathers who are chiefly quoted for the confirmation of this hypothesis are Ephrem and Aphrahaṭ. Three remarks will not be out of place in this connexion:

1. According to a very probable hypothesis, confirmed by the testimony of almost all the Syrian authors, Ephrem commented upon the Diatessaron; his text, therefore, must have been that of the Diatessaron. We may consequently assume for certain that so long as Tatian's Harmony is not found in its original text, our scientific edifice, on this subject, will be built on pure hypothesis deprived of the natural likelihood of safe criticism. What weight can we attribute, for instance, to two hypotheses to which we may reasonably add five others? As to the case of Aphrahaṭ, our ignorance is even more accentuated, because we cannot tell with certitude what exactly was the version that he used. Was it the Curetonian? Was it the Lewisian? Was it an older form of the Pshiṭta? Was it the Diatessaron? Moreover, the case of this Father writing in the valley of the Tigris, in the old land of Adiabene, cannot be considered as a good instance for the nature of the Syriac Version used in Roman Mesopotamia and in Syria. In fact, some quotations made by this Father agree with one of the four Syriac Versions and disagree with the other, and some quotations disagree with all of them.

2. Our ignorance about the exact text used by the Aramæan writers may be extended even to many Fathers who wrote after the time of Rabbūla. A special mention must be made here of the famous Sahdona[3] and of John of Phének.[4] From the quotations of these two Fathers, to mention only two, it is almost certain that the Syrian writers even of the seventh century and onwards were either using a text lost to-day or quoting from memory and giving more the sense than the precise wording of the Version that they were reading.

3. As I have myself happily found, in a MS. of the seventh to the eighth century, the works of a celebrated Syrian writer, Gregory of Cyprus, whose books were considered as irreparably lost to science, a study by Dr. Rendel Harris will soon be pub-

[1] Cf. P. Martin, *Actes du brigandage d'Éphèse*, pp. 54, 60, 71.

[2] Cf. Dr. R. Harris' article in the *Expositor*, 1913, pp. 456–465.

[3] P. Bedjan's *S. Martyrii qui est Sahdona quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig, 1902.

[4] A. Mingana's *Sources Syriaques*, vol. i. pars. 11, Leipzig, 1908.

lished about the Biblical importance of this discovery, and will demonstrate that the author who was writing about A.D. 360 was quoting a text nearer to the Pshiṭta than to any other Syriac Version even if it does not altogether agree with it.

From what we have stated above we may conclude that the greatest uncertainty is to be admitted about Rabbūla and the origins of the Syriac Pshiṭta. We cannot, unhappily, substitute irrefragable data for the surmises that we found ourselves bound to weaken. Two things seem to be probable.

(*a*) The appearance of the Pshiṭta Version is to be assigned to a time preceding at least by some forty years the epoch of the great Christological movement which gave birth to *Dyophysitism* and *Monophysitism*. A Biblical text must have been prepared some years before these heresies, in order that it might have the good fortune to be considered as authoritative by Nestorians and Jacobites alike. The constant use by both Syrian Churches of the same Version without any accusation directed by a member of one community against a partisan of the tenets of the opposite community in the matter of the interpolation of the sacred text is of great weight on this subject, and strictly obliges us to attribute the paternity of the Pshiṭta to a man held in esteem by both Churches in the same manner.

(*b*) The style used in this Version does not point to a very high antiquity of composition, and does not reflect that simplicity of diction which characterizes sometimes the archaism of a first attempt in any work done by new proselytes. As it stands, we are unable to make it go back to a period prior to the end of the third century. On the other hand, by its quality of being probably a revision of the old Syriac text undertaken with the purpose of rendering it more in harmony with the Greek original as current in Syria and in Palestine at the beginning of the fourth century, it is very possible to suppose that it has been produced at the time when the persecution of Sapor II. strengthened the union of Eastern Christians with their brothers of the Roman Empire.

We know that streams of refugees flowed from all parts of the kingdom of the Sassanides into Roman territory, and by a natural course of events the Christians wished to have the same Biblical text as that of their benefactors and co-religionists. Some years later, on the entrance in the learned Christian circles of Greek philosophy, the necessity for theological discussions of a Version corresponding almost exactly to the Greek text, made the first Syriac Versions unsuitable for daily use, and the Pshiṭta Version became generally the Vulgate of all Syriac-speaking Churches from that period down to our own day. We do not deny the hypothetic character of the last few lines, but compared with what has been stated above and with the general course of events this hypothesis seems, in the present state of our knowledge, the most plausible.

By the diversity of the style used in the different chapters of the same Gospel, and by some linguistic features found in one Gospel and missing in another, it is possible to admit that the revision of the old Syriac Versions into the Pshiṭta form of our day has not been prepared by the same man nor elaborated at the same period. We deem that a critical study of this Version cannot be safely undertaken at present, until a final and scientific edition of it is given to Syrologues. Our study on the Lewisian and on the Curetonian is confined to one manuscript, and a scholar in perusing the excellent editions prepared by their respective discoverers is sure not to commit grave errors in his dealings with them. To enter, therefore, into comparative and more accentuated linguistic details would be premature and generally useful only to specialists; but the above statements will suffice to give the impression that so far the scientific investigations of the current theme are by no means exhausted.

ALPHONSE MINGANA.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

'Inspired' Supplication (James v. 16).

I AM much interested in your exposition of this great verse, and write to add a little information which is exclusive to the few who have inherited a copy of that precious volume, the Revisers' (unpublished) First Draft. Its peculiar value is that it tells us when a clear majority of the Revisers favoured a changed reading or rendering; for in the final revision (alas!) eight conservatives could outvote fifteen reformers. In this case the interest is of a different kind. There are two marginal

readings against 'earnest,' which appears in the text; the second anticipates the interpretation you quote from my friend, Dr. Rendel Harris: it is, 'Or, *working mightily*, or, *inwrought* from above.' I remember my father, Dr. W. F. Moulton, insisting on that last translation well over thirty years ago, when I read the Epistle first as one of his boys at The Leys; and I think he must have been kept away from the Jerusalem Chamber when that chapter was finally revised, and both text and margin damaged. I chronicled this in 1906 (*Prolegomena*, p. 156), and noted that by that time the passive rendering of ἐνεργουμένη was coming to its own, thanks especially to Dr. J. B. Mayor, and to Dean Armitage Robinson's note in his classical commentary on *Ephesians*. Now you tell us 'scholars are unanimous,' and I am very glad, though I should demur to the suggestion that the majority showed 'insufficient scholarship' when they preferred the middle to the passive. I should hardly like to assert dogmatically that ἐνεργεῖσθαι is *never* middle.

But if ἐνεργουμένη is passive, we have to ask ὑπὸ τίνος; I have always answered 'By the Holy Spirit,' and in a little commentary on the Epistle (not yet published) I translate 'inspired.' And my reasons are, firstly, that the verb is almost a technical word in the N.T. to describe *Divine* energy; and secondly, that the example of Elijah, James's own proof, seems to require it. Where is it said in the Book of Kings that Elijah prayed either for drought or for rain? Elijah's very first appearance is with the words: 'As Yahweh the God of Israel liveth, *before whom I stand*, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word.' Elijah lives in the King's Presence-chamber; and 'surely the Lord Yahweh will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.' When the drought is about to end, 'the word of Yahweh came to Elijah, in the third year, saying, Go, show thyself unto Ahab; and I will send rain upon the earth.' Again prayer is listening, not speech—receiving, not asking. I am greatly relieved in my own mind to think that Elijah did *not* entreat God for this awful judgment on his people, from a mere personal conviction that they needed it. But if God whispered His intention into the prophet's ear, I can well understand his making this supplication. Men may say it becomes superfluous, if God has already declared what He means to do. Yes, but how do we know what are the determining conditions of drought, or rain, or any phenomena in the outward world? Does the physicist claim that he knows *all* the forces that maintain or disturb the delicate balance? May not spiritual forces count for a great deal more than we know? 'More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.'

In urging the importance of recognizing '*inspired* supplication' in this *locus classicus* on Prayer, I am not rejecting the very interesting deductions you yourself draw. But 'the energy that the man himself throws into it' may be admitted in the same breath as the assertion that the energy is Divine. Paul is at one here with James—as usual! Paul contradicts himself flagrantly within one sentence when he bids the Philippians work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, 'FOR it is God which worketh in you [ἐνεργῶν!] both to will and to work, for his good pleasure'! The work is all ours, *and* it is all God's. Strange that Paul, a quite unusually intelligent man, never saw the faulty logic of which any dabbler in philosophy can so easily convict him! And again Paul tells the Romans that 'the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered'—*our* groanings, therefore. We cannot expect to understand in this world the full meaning of Divine Immanence. But just as parallel straight lines meet at infinity, so do many contradictory truths meet in God.

Perhaps the main reason why I have been wrestling with this great text and context for years past is that James draws such an amazing inference as to the problem of pain. The 'Christian' 'Scientist' has interpreted James quite literally, and produced a *reductio ad absurdum*. The senior members of the congregation are to gather round the sick man, and when they have used a simple remedy they are to pray over him. 'And the prayer of faith shall save [physically] him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up.' So if there were only enough 'elders' in the world who could pray a 'prayer of faith,' there would be 'no more death, neither mourning, nor crying, nor pain.' Then what about that prayer which did not remove Paul's 'thorn in the flesh'? Nay, what about that other prayer which only brought the agony of Calvary upon that of the Garden?

I think that ἐνεργουμένη holds the key to the problem. Elijah was not the last man admitted to the Presence, to hear things that cannot be uttered.

There are two mothers whose sons are starting for the front to-day, close friends, and both alike devout and loving and full of faith. Both have been praying fervently that their boys may return safely. In the prayer of one there is a serene certainty. She will pray on, till the Evil Thing is over; and all the time she *knows* she will see him again safe and sound. In the other prayer there is from the first the note of resignation. The mother has given her son to her country's need, and she knows that very many will not only offer but lay down life for what is dearer than life—why should her boy be spared when another mother is heart-broken? So in her unceasing prayer there is the burden, 'Father, if it be possible, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will but thine be done!' What shall we say when the first woman's son comes home unhurt, only to tell how his friend charged him with dying messages of love to his mother? Was there less faith in one prayer than the other? Was the first prayer superfluous and the other unheard on high? Nay, was not the one an unseen agency in God's hand which did its part in keeping that soldier safe from harm? A thousand fell at his side, but it came not near him, for Prayer kept shot and shell away. And as to the other prayer, was it not answered from the first with 'power made perfect in weakness'? We ask wistfully why one was taken and the other left. Ah, but we do not know what ordained tasks were waiting, one here, another There. The prayer that seemingly was not answered will bring the stricken mother grace for her need, and if not vision, most certainly faith, that somewhere her boy is already beginning a more important duty than she dreamed for him to do on earth. Such, I take it, is 'inspired supplication.' How does it work in that faithful community that James portrays? One member is sick, and there come to him at his call other members, ripe in experience of the things of God. They use an ordinary remedy, praying for blessing on its use; and they pray for him, when he has told them what is on his mind, as they are ready to tell him what is on theirs. In gracious fellowship they seek the Lord together, and a conviction steals into their minds that God still has need of His servant to serve Him here. Who sent it? He who can use both the oil and the prayer to cure the body He made, and accounts the prayer more potent than the oil, or even than our whole modern pharmacopœia.[1]

James does not here contemplate the case where these good men will pray, and pray believingly, but physical 'saving' will *not* follow. But was it not he who told us that our words should always be, 'If the Lord will, we shall both live, and do this or that'? We may be sure he never dreamed that those 'elders' would always have the inspired conviction that their brother would recover. One recalls that picture, familiar to every Methodist, of the dying Wesley in the little room in City Road, with his preachers around him. Some are weeping; all, we may be sure, are praying. Were they wanting in faith if they hardly thought of asking that God would add to those wonderfully fruitful eighty-eight years? Did not faith rather bring to them the message that God would take away their master from their head that day? The prayer of faith pleaded for grace to do God's work without him. And the experience of a century and a quarter tells us that it was answered.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

[1] May I note here that I am trying to interpret an amazing personal experience of Mr. C. T. Studd's in the heart of Africa, as told us by himself at the W.M.M.S. meeting in Manchester this March?

Entre Nous.

Illustrations from the War.

The best series of illustrations from the War have been sent by the Rev. J. Allen, Moresby Rectory, Whitehaven. Other ten who sent excellent collections have been communicated with privately. The number of fine illustrations available has been a surprise. It is a surprise also that so many of them directly illustrate texts of Scripture.

The Editor is willing to make the same offer again—that is to say, a set of the *Great Texts of the Bible* (twenty volumes), or their equivalent in other books chosen from Messrs. T. & T. Clark's catalogue—for the best series of illustrations of the Bible on religious and ethical topics from incidents connected with the War. He offers also a set of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible* (six

volumes)—or their equivalent as before—for the second best series. The texts or topics illustrated should be given, and the source of the illustration, together with the date.

An Anthology.

An attractive little anthology of prose and verse has been added to Messrs. Allen & Unwin's 'Sesame Library' under the title of *Life's Pilgrimage* (1s. net). The selections have been made by Edwin H. Eland. Here is a quotation from Mary Cholmondeley:

THE ETERNAL THINGS.

Hope, and Love, and Enthusiasm never die. We think in youth that we bury them in the graveyards of our hearts, but the grass never yet grew over them. How then can life be sad, when they walk beside us always in the growing light towards the Perfect Day?

Conrad Aiken.

Mr. Conrad Aiken's poetry recalls the poetry of John Masefield, and he knows it. But he claims that before he ever heard of Masefield he was experimenting with narrative poems of modern daily life. The volume which he has published contains eleven poems, all narrative, all of modern daily life, and all reminiscent somewhat of Masefield. But there is no slavish imitation. Mr. Aiken is a true poet. The poems are too long for quotation. Here are a few lines out of one. The title of the book is *Earth Triumphant* (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net).

Up from the valley's dark, two miles below,
The light wind brought a fading sound of bells,
The church clock struck the hour, sweet and slow,
Some notes they missed, some came with the wind's swells;
The wind came soft, sweet with the soft night smells,
Meadows and pines, and dew on new-mown grass;
So time passes, so even earth must pass.

The hymns *O Love that wilt not let me go* and *I think when I read that sweet story of old* have been separately printed and published, adorned happily with pictures and decorations (Abingdon Press; 25 cents net).

R. A. Cumine.

The Rev. R. A. Cumine has put his conception of the gospel into poetry. It is a portrait of *The Messiah* (Century Press; 3s. 6d. net), but it is the Messiah as interpreted by a theologian and with an unmistakable design. The design is to preach the gospel. And does not George Herbert tell us—

> A verse may find him who a sermon flies,
> And turn delight into a sacrifice?

Let us quote a few lines from Mr. Cumine's poem:

And Jesus lifting up His eyes to heaven
Gave thanks unto the Father, that the Jews
Might hear Him and believe; and standing there
Cried with a sudden loud and startling cry:
Lazarus, come forth! And sleeping Lazarus heard,
And straightway from the height or from the deep
Returned obedient; and that awful shape
Crept out into the sunshine from the tomb.
Some shrieked and hid their faces; many stood
Like men that have been frozen into stone
Not knowing yet if this were life indeed,
Or some terrific jugglery with death.
None moved to touch him until Jesus said:
Loose him, and let him go! Then all at once
Brake forth the mighty tumult of their joy.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. J. B. Maclean, Huntingdon, Quebec.

Illustrations for the Great Text for June must be received by the 20th of March. The text is Ph 2^{9-11}.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Doctrine of Prayer is engaging attention as it never did before. This is one of the results of the war. But before the war began, the mind of the Editor of this magazine was drawn to the subject. It seemed to him that much of the neglect of Prayer, which was then so evident, was due to ignorance. He resolved to edit a volume on the Christian Doctrine of Prayer to serve as the basis of Sunday or weekday evening addresses or Bible Class lectures. The volume is now ready. Not a few men make their arrangements for next winter's work early in the summer. Perhaps they will look at this book. They will find the subject of Prayer, for the understanding of which so many hearts and minds are ready, set forth clearly and fully, in touch with modern thought, and well illustrated from modern literature.

There is a chapter on Prayer in Dr. J. R. ILLINGWORTH'S new volume. His subject is *The Gospel Miracles* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). But there is much more in the book than that title would lead one to look for. There is not a little philosophy. For Dr. ILLINGWORTH'S mind is essentially philosophical. He loves to handle facts, but he loves better to draw conclusions from them. He discusses the miracles in the Gospels, but at much greater length he discusses miracle. And it is quite appropriate to his whole manner that he should devote a chapter to the Christian doctrine of Prayer.

Dr. ILLINGWORTH recognizes the difficulty of discussing prayer. No doubt he recognizes also the difficulty of believing in it. But we are well on the way to overcoming the scientific and even the philosophical difficulties that have gathered round the belief in prayer. The difficulty of discussing it we shall never be able to overcome.

For not only is prayer apt to escape from under discussion, but, besides that, we have not the evidence for a satisfactory discussion in our hands. The man of science gathers his facts, compares them with other facts, classifies them, and draws his legitimate conclusions. The man of prayer has only the facts of his own personal experience to work with. These are to him convincing enough, but he cannot spread them out in the sight of other men in order to convince them. In every attempt at a declaration of what prayer has been in a man's life much is lost of the meaning and power of it. The very attempt is hard to make. For the life of prayer is a hidden life. Those who are ready to criticize its efficacy are those who do not pray. They are therefore unable to understand its efficacy. There is no doubt that much can be said in favour of prayer, and never more than at the present time; and Dr.

Illingworth proceeds to say it. But it is right to admit at the outset that no argument for prayer will convince a man who does not pray.

Perhaps the commonest conception of Prayer is that it is a crutch. This conception has been the occasion of much mock heroic literature. For the acceptance of such literature Emerson is chiefly responsible. But even those who have too much of the mind of Christ to come under Emerson's influence are sometimes carried away by the idea that the best use of prayer is to ask God to make us independent of prayer. 'Prayer,' says Emerson, 'that craves a particular commodity, anything less than all good, is vicious. Prayer is the contemplation of the facts of life from the highest point of view. It is the soliloquy of a beholding and jubilant soul. It is the spirit of God pronouncing his works good. But prayer, as a means to effect a private end, is meanness and theft. It pre-supposes dualism, and not unity in nature and consciousness. As soon as the man is at one with God he will not beg. He will then see prayer in all action. The prayer of the farmer kneeling in his field to weed it, the prayer of the rower kneeling with the stroke of his oar, are prayers heard throughout nature.'

Prayer is regarded as a crutch by those also who resort to it only in times of dire distress. This is wholly at variance with Christ's precept and Christ's example. Christ lived by prayer and He intended His followers to live by it. He taught His disciples to look upon the Spirit and all the gifts of the Spirit as to be had for the asking, and only for the asking. No doubt there are good gifts of God that come to us without prayer. He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth His rain on the just and also on the unjust. But even temporal gifts like these are to be asked for. Why? That when we receive them we may appreciate them and turn them to their most profitable use.

There is an article in *The Harvard Theological Review* for April on 'Religious Reserve.' It is not a pleasant article. The author, a Unitarian minister of the name of Edward F. Hayward, is too conscious of his own superiority. Almost an unbeliever himself, he has nothing but scorn for those who speak as if they had some assurance of God, or some intimate experience of His love in their lives.

He has seen preachers, he says, who spoke on Sunday as if they knew something about God, and on Monday were attracted by 'the modesty and restfulness of agnosticism.' He quotes with satisfaction the saying of Goethe: 'With the people, and especially with the clergymen, who have Him daily on their tongues, God becomes a phrase, a mere name, which they utter without any accompanying idea. But if they were penetrated by His greatness they would rather be dumb, and for very reverence would not name Him.'

The article is as ill-timed as it is unpleasant. We need no warning at present to be reserved in our religious conversation. We are much too reserved. What we need to be told by such a writer as the author of this article is simply not to run beyond experience in our speech. But that is not in his thoughts. It seems to him that God should be kept at so respectful a distance that no speech of what He is or what He has done for us could ever be possible.

There is an article of another kind in *The Times* for April 6. Its author is Mr. E. A. Burroughs, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford.

What Mr. Burroughs finds at the present time is 'a persistent vein of scepticism in all our faith.' We do not deny the existence of God. 'We claim that there is a Fact which is the crucial factor in the present situation'—the present situation being due to the war. We give a place to God in our scheme of existence, but it is a modest place with a shadowy meaning. And so our belief 'falls

short of dynamic value, and hardly issues in outward life.'

It is therefore not for greater reserve about God that Mr. BURROUGHS pleads; it is for greater assurance and franker speech.

First it is for greater assurance. He would have us 'believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' To believe so is to be consistent. For already we know that the spiritual is the real and the permanent. It is our knowledge of this that seems to make life possible. Already we are living by faith—far more of us than recognize it. Already we endure as seeing that which is invisible. 'If 19th-century materialism were not already dead the war would certainly have killed it.' And yet we hesitate and halt between two opinions.

Mr. BURROUGHS calls for consistency—'that hardest of graces for Britons to acquire.' If we believe, why do we not obtain the benefit of our belief? We must give the unseen things their place and value. We have not shaken ourselves quite clear of materialism. Having driven it out in the name of physical science, we have let it in again in the name of psychology. Conversion is a matter of psychological experiment. But, says Mr. BURROUGHS, 'because there may be a psychological explanation of conversion, it does not follow that there is no theological cause. The tappings of the wireless "receiver" may no doubt be explained as due to electrical disturbances in the immediate neighbourhood of the ship's mast; but that is not the whole explanation, nor the significant part of it.'

What Mr. BURROUGHS pleads for, therefore, in the present situation is the disuse of vague and distant phrases like 'the spiritual factor.' Let us boldly substitute the conception of a personal God, *and act accordingly*. 'We have to learn from our enemies. We may not approve their conception of God, nor like their ways of expressing their trust in Him. But the fact remains that in Germany the churches are full, while here they are —well, also "as usual." And the Kaiser's recognitions of God are perhaps a thing which our Press and politicians might occasionally imitate instead of deriding. If we think God in any way counts in the war, we might at least not seem to wish to forget it.'

That then is the first thing, we must be surer of God and give Him a larger place in our lives. The other thing is that we must speak more frequently about Him. Therein lies salvation for ourselves as for others. For it is 'if thou shalt confess with thy mouth,' as well as 'believe in thine heart' that 'thou shalt be saved.'

Is it not possible? Is our British reserve an immovable wall? We are doing it already in a way that is closely related. Very finely Mr. BURROUGHS says: 'Trouble has been bringing many of us nearer to one another, and showing us how alike we all are in the deepest things. And to be able to talk a little about them has brought, to many reserved people, a great enrichment of life. We have felt at work in us the process which St. Paul calls "the mutual building of each into each." That way, we all recognize, lies the true path of human progress, whether we think of the Eternal Goal at the end of it as "the Brotherhood of Man" or "the building up of the Body of Christ." Could we not be more consistent here also, and more often, and as a duty, give one another the benefit of our faith as well as of our doubts? True corporate life and feeling, whether inside or outside what we call "the Churches," can only be built on the freest interchange of personality between individuals, deliberately surrendering their right to spiritual isolation, and admitting to one another their common indebtedness and devotion to the common source of their spiritual life.'

What do we wait for? We wait for a lead. Where is the lead to come from? From the

clergy, perhaps. But writing in *The Times*, Mr. BURROUGHS writes to the laity. He bids them wait for no lead. 'Every man in Christ is by rights "a man under authority, having soldiers under him"; and the *raison d'être* of a Christian is to be a leader of men. Every one of us, however humble, is called to give a lead in his own surroundings. In family and business life, in the small problems of personal action, in the casual intercourse of the street or the train, the spiritual man will find abundant opportunity of disclosing his own standards, his own perspective, and making others conscious of the light by which he lives. Only he must subdue his horror of "giving himself away": to do so is half the battle of leadership.

> Pour forth and bravely do your part,
> O knights of the unshielded heart!
> Forth and for ever forward!—out
> From prudent turret and redoubt!'

What is the value of 'belief' in the New Testament? Take an example. In Acts 13^{12} we are told that Sergius Paulus, the Proconsul of Cyprus, 'when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the teaching of the Lord.' Does that mean that Sergius Paulus was converted? Does it mean that he became a Christian?

Mr. RACKHAM, who is the author of the best English Commentary on the Acts, says it does not. For to him 'it seems incredible that at this date a Roman proconsul could have been converted.' He does not mean that it was beyond the power of God to convert a proconsul. But it would have made such a stir that all the world was bound to hear of it. The Dean of WINCHESTER agrees. Dean FURNEAUX is the author of the latest Commentary on the Acts, and it runs Mr. RACKHAM'S hard for the first place. Dr. FURNEAUX agrees. 'The conversion of a Proconsul,' he says, 'would have been an event of the first importance, such as we should expect to find recorded even by secular historians, since it would almost certainly have necessitated the resignation of his office which involved official patronage of idolatrous worship.'

Sir W. M. RAMSAY discusses the question in his new book, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s.).

He is at one with Mr. RACKHAM and the Dean of WINCHESTER. To believe, he says, is not necessarily to be converted and become a Christian. The case of Simon Magus is almost conclusive evidence that sometimes it means no more than intellectual assent. In the language of St. Luke there are three stages in the process called salvation. First there is belief. After belief comes 'turning to the Lord,' of which the seal is baptism. The last stage is the settled Christian life.

Now it usually happens that St. Luke names only the first of these stages. He takes it for granted that the other two will follow. But he knew that the second and third stages might not follow, and so sometimes he adds them or at least one of them. Accordingly, Sir W. M. RAMSAY thinks that the state of mind called believing sometimes advances no further than intellectual assent and emotional impression; and it would not be safe to assert that belief always was followed even by baptism.

There is no probability that the Proconsul was baptized. If he had been baptized St. Luke would have been sure to mention it, for he pays great regard to the attitude of the Romans to the new religion. In the same way it is said of those to whom St. Paul preached in Athens that 'certain men also clave to him and believed, among whom was Dionysius the Areopagite and Damaris.' No baptism seems to have been administered, and no Church was founded. The effect produced on a few persons may have been genuine and deep, but the Apostle did not remain to follow it up, and

Sir W. M. RAMSAY believes that no real conversions were made in Athens.

From these cases, then, and from all that is said in the New Testament, the conclusion seems unavoidable that Sergius Paulus did not become a Christian. But, outside the New Testament, evidence has been found which persuades Sir W. M. RAMSAY that the conclusion is wrong.

The evidence is obtained from inscriptions. First there is an inscription which was discovered in Pisidian Antioch after the systematic excavation of that city began in 1912. In that inscription there occurs the name of Lucius Sergius Paullus the younger. It was at once perceived by Sir W. M. RAMSAY, and it has since been admitted by other scholars, that Lucius Sergius Paullus the younger is the son of Sergius Paulus the Cyprus Proconsul in the Book of Acts.

Next there is an inscription which has been published for nearly thirty years but hitherto has been totally misunderstood. This inscription occupies the whole of a large block of limestone which was set up in Antioch in honour of a distinguished citizen and his wife. The block is broken, only the second part of the lady's name was at first read, and no one thought anything about it. But in 1913 the other part was discovered and now the whole name can be read. The name is Sergia Paulla.

What does it signify? It signifies that L. Sergius Paullus, the son of Sergius Paulus the Proconsul of Cyprus, was governor of Galatia, and that during his office his sister was married to this citizen of Antioch. Now it is quite certain, from his position as governor of Galatia, that L. Sergius Paullus the younger was a pagan. It is nearly as certain that his sister was a Christian.

For this inscription was erected by her oldest son, *and it is in Greek.* That is a degeneration which at this early age would have been impossible for a Roman and a pagan. But if Sergia Paulla's son was a Christian, it was natural and almost inevitable that he should write in Greek. Sir W. M. RAMSAY's conclusion is that he learned his Christianity from his mother, and that his mother learned it from her father, the Sergius Paulus of the narrative in the Acts.

Mr. Arnold J. TOYNBEE has written a book on *Nationality and the War* (Dent; 7s. 6d. net). Its title gives little indication of its contents. It is an elaborate forecast of the changes that are to take place on the map of the world when the war is over. They who will have the making of these changes must take account of the great fact of Nationality. That is the explanation of the title.

Who will have the making of the changes on the map of the world? Mr. TOYNBEE believes it will be ourselves and our Allies. But he is cautious and very considerate. He does not say that this and that will take place 'when we win.' He says 'if we win.' For he has a much clearer conception of the work that has to be done before we win than the confident comfortable reader of the British daily press. He believes that we will win. He wrote in January. If he were writing now he would express himself more emphatically. But all he writes he writes on the understanding that when the war is over victory will be with Britain and her Allies. The changes on the map will have to be made by them.

Meantime Britain and her Allies have to win. Why forecast the future? Because, says Mr. TOYNBEE, that is our duty and we dare not shirk it. It is our duty now: we dare not postpone it. If we wait until that day when we read in the newspaper that the war is over, we shall find that we have made a serious and irreparable mistake. For we shall be only at the beginning of our real task. The reconstruction of the map of the World in many places, of the map of Europe in nearly every place, will still be in our hands. Our policy,

after hostilities, will be decided by our own Government *relying for its authority on the country behind it.* And the country will not be able to use wisely the immense power of decision which will fall upon it.

Mr. TOYNBEE does not expect that every man 'who has a vote' will make himself acquainted with the past history and the present condition of every country in Europe. There are men like himself to whom much of the ground is familiar, but they are few. What he expects of the British voter is that he would acquaint himself with the great principles which must guide the Government in its decisions, and with as much as he can of the way in which these principles ought to be applied in every particular case. Both are set forth in this book, the principles in a short introductory chapter, the application in the rest of its five hundred pages.

The greatest principle of all, the great fact which has to be taken account of in the settlement of every problem that arises after the war, is Nationality. But before we consider what Nationality is, we must come to some decision on two matters of ethical interest. We must decide whether we are to be moved by the desire for revenge, and we must decide whether we are to be moved by the instinct of plunder.

Are we to be moved by the desire for revenge? We answer, Yes. We are making that answer every day. At the very beginning of the war, a certain French word was unfortunately translated by the English word 'revenge,' though it does not mean revenge. That gave us encouragement. Then came the atrocities in Belgium, in Flanders, in Poland, and the outrages on the English coast. Yet Mr. TOYNBEE tells us that if we make our decisions after the war in the spirit of revenge, we shall lose that very thing for which we have gone to war—the end of war. For 'if we beat Germany and then humiliate her, she will never rest,' he says, 'till she has "redeemed her honour," by humiliating us more cruelly in turn. Instead of being free to return to our own pressing business, we shall have to be constantly on the watch against her. Two great nations will sit idle, weapon in hand, like two Afghans in their loopholed towers when the blood feud is between them; and we shall have sacrificed deliberately and to an ever-increasing extent, for the blood feud grows by geometrical progression, the very freedom for which we are now giving our lives.'

Are we to be moved by the instinct of plunder? Again we answer, Yes. We are making *that* answer every day. And have we not reason? Mr. TOYNBEE knows that we have reason. Yet he asks us to consider. Modern wealth is international. That is its characteristic feature. 'Economic gain and loss,' he says, 'is shared by the whole world, and the shifting of the economic balance does not correspond to the moves in the game of diplomatists and armies. Germany's economic growth has been a phenomenon quite independent of her political ambitions, and Germany's economic ruin would compromise something far greater than Germany's political future — the whole world's prosperity. British wealth, among the rest, would be dealt a deadly wound by Germany's economic death, and it would be idle to pump Germany's last life-blood into our veins, if we were automatically draining them of our own blood in the process.'

That issue is enough. It is not the only issue, but it is enough. Mr. TOYNBEE passes to Nationality. In the great regrouping that is to take place, a regrouping which we earnestly hope will have some permanence, respect must be had to the claims of Nationality.

Now Nationality is not easy to define. 'Like all great forces in human life, it is nothing material or mechanical, but a subjective psychological feeling in living people. This feeling can be kindled by the presence of one or several of a series of factors: a common country, especially if it is a

well-defined physical region, like an island, a river basin, or a mountain mass; a common language, especially if it has given birth to a literature; a common religion; and that much more impalpable force, a common tradition or sense of memories shared from the past.'

But these definitions do not all apply to every nation. Perhaps they do not all apply to any nation in the Earth. 'Great Britain is a nation by geography and tradition. Ireland is an island smaller still and more compact, and is further unified by the almost complete predominance of the same English language, for the Keltic speech is incomparably less vigorous here than in Wales; yet the absence of common tradition combines with religious differences to divide the country into two nationalities, at present sharply distinct from one another and none the less hostile because their national psychology is strikingly the same. Germany is divided by religion in precisely the same way as Ireland, her common tradition is hardly stronger, and her geographical boundaries quite vague: yet she has built up her present concentrated national feeling in three generations. Italy has geography, language and tradition to bind her together, and yet a more vivid tradition is able to separate the Ticinese from his neighbours, and bind him to people of alien speech and religion beyond a great mountain range. The Armenian nationality does not occupy a continuous territory, but lives by language and religion. The Jews speak the language of the country where they sojourn, but religion and tradition hold them together. The agnostic Jew accepts not only the language but all the other customs of his adopted countrymen, but tradition by itself is too strong for him: he remains a Jew and cannot be assimilated.'

That being so, we must judge each case on its own merits. National problems hitherto remote and uninteresting to us, must be taken up in earnest, that we may get as near to the truth concerning them as we possibly can. We must listen to the wishes of the different populations. We must consider how far we can reconcile their wishes with one another and with geography. We must, as far as in us lies, come to the conference at the end of the war—which, says Mr. TOYNBEE, is so much more important than the war itself—with a clear idea of the alternative solutions, and a mature judgment upon their relative merits.

One example will be enough. Let it be Poland.

The nation of the Poles is at present partitioned between three empires, Germany, Austria, and Russia. The peaceful maintenance of the *status quo* in Europe meant for the Poles the perpetuation of this calamity for an indefinite period, perhaps for ever. The outbreak of war, the common disaster of their taskmasters, kindled for them a glimmer of fresh hope.

What can the Poles hope to gain from the war? Their highest hope can be no more than the creation of a united national state, enjoying internal autonomy but incorporated in a larger political organization. And the question is whether that larger organization is to be Russia, Austria, or Germany. Each of these Powers would be glad to make concessions to the Poles already subject to it in order to attract within its border upon the same terms the remaining sections of the nation.

Russia has made a great offer already. But Russia is the traditional enemy of the Polish nation. 'The two peoples have been rival leaders of the Slavonic world. Poland drew her culture from the Latin West, and her peasantry remained staunch to the Catholic Church during the crisis of the Reformation: Russia took upon herself the inheritance of the Byzantine Empire. Since 1814 more than half Poland's territory and population, including the national capital, Warsaw, has been incorporated in the Russian Empire. Accordingly, the national revolts of 1831 and 1863 were directed primarily, and in effect solely, against Russian rule, and in the concerted repression which they provoked from the three powers, the Russian Govern-

ment has taken the lead. The most cruel symbol of Poland's humiliation is the flaunting Orthodox Cathedral planted in the chief public square of Warsaw.'

Austria-Hungary, the 'ramshackle empire,' has been unable, perhaps it has been unwilling, to take the place of prime oppressor. Its true policy has been to become a 'happy family,' in which various nationalities should live and let live side by side. And the Poles have had exceptional favour. 'In 1869 the province of Galicia, Austria's share in the Polish spoils, was granted a far-reaching measure of Home Rule, and Polish was declared the normal language of its administration and higher education.'

These concessions have made the Austrian Poles the most loyal citizens of the Empire. The Polish members of the Austrian Reichsrath are looked upon as the 'government party.' On them the ministry can always rely for the voting of supplies and the passing of army bills. When the Russians invaded Galicia the Polish population rose *en masse* against them. They have certainly not abandoned the hope of national reunion, but they look for it not within the Russian, but within the Austrian Empire.

But Germany has to be reckoned with. And the Germans have treated the Poles within their borders so badly that if to a reunited Poland the alternative were offered of Russia or Austro-Germany, they would undoubtedly say Russia. The Poles love not Russia, but they love Germany less. Now they already see that in the present alliance between Germany and Austria the predominant partner is Germany. If Germany and Austria win the war, it will be Germany's and not Austria's policy that will be imposed on Europe in general and on Poland in particular. The Poles shudder to think what that will mean. In the progress of the war Poles and Russians are being fused together in feeling by the fire of a common hate. Mr. Toynbee firmly believes that when we and our Allies win, the erection of a reunited Poland within the Russian Empire is almost assured. The Polish subjects of Germany will vote to a man for liberation from her dominion, and they will carry the Austrian Poles with them.

The Study of Theology.

By Alban G. Widgery, M.A.(Camb.), University of St. Andrews.

A careful study of the history of particular sciences such as mathematics, physics, biology, and history leads to the conclusion that, apart from any consideration of the ease or difficulty of the research in any case, those sciences have made the greatest and most rapid progress which have been prosecuted by appropriate methods and untrammelled by external authority. The liberty of the student is not to be confused with caprice, although at the inception of every science many hypotheses have been in the highest degree arbitrary. The demand for liberty, which is now satisfied in almost every branch of research, is simply to follow reason and experience wherever they may lead. Freedom soon becomes distinguished from caprice in that individuals recognize the necessity of co-operation and of the advantage of working according to methods especially appropriate to the subject under investigation. Freedom modified by method, and method made more or less elastic through freedom, have enabled advance which would otherwise have been impossible. Freedom is an attitude of mind, positive in relation to reason, negative in relation to any external power. Method is the mode of scientific procedure dependent upon the nature of the data which are being considered and the aim to be realized.

In the Western world research in all its branches was for long under the control of the ecclesiastical powers. This may be admitted without the necessity of denying what the Church did for

educational progress within its own limits. Except for the individual efforts of a few thinkers, such as Galileo and Bruno, the demand for freedom first arose in the sphere of religion itself. In the Protestant Reformation this demand met with a certain degree of satisfaction. At that time, however, there was no clear notion of scientific and progressive methods of study, and the deposed authority of the Church was soon replaced by that of the letter of the Scriptures. The freedom attained was more real and continuous in those branches of research which acquired definite methods of procedure, as did the investigation of nature under the guidance of Bacon, Newton, and Kepler. Little by little the spirit of freedom has become predominant in all regions of profane knowledge, and to it we owe in great measure the results which have been obtained.

Theology alone is still fettered by the limitations imposed upon it by an authority external to itself. Theology alone still suffers from absolute uncertainty and poverty of method. For in the Christian world Theology has been and is almost entirely dogmatic, starting with certain quite arbitrary assumptions and arguing to certain foregone conclusions. The chief assumptions are the truth of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and, among Catholics, the validity of the claim of the Church to interpret them. The foregone conclusions may be summarized as the traditional creeds. At times philosophers have independently discussed theological problems, but no free scientific Theology has yet been established. In this region of research, the greatest need of to-day is perfect liberty to seek and proclaim the truth, unconcerned by the acquiescence or denial of the dignatories of any ecclesiastical organization whatever. That granted, a clear understanding of the aim, scope, and methods of Theology is essential. Progress is much more rapid, results are much more accurate, and labour is reduced, if this latter demand is satisfied as fully as possible at the outset.

Every science is made up of propositions which are either directly descriptive or inferential. The former refer to immediate experiences; the latter are arrived at by a process of reasoning from the former. A science is thus a body of knowledge of such propositions, capable of growth by an increase in their number or their comprehension. The process of growth leading to differentiation and greater complexity, the field of research ultimately becomes too large to be adequately investigated by any single individual, and special regions must be marked off for separate treatment. But this division of labour, although it leads to progress with reference to matters of detail, is likely to be detrimental to our understanding of experience unless it is supplemented by a careful consideration of the relation of the various studies to one another. The lack of a general consideration is one of the most marked features of present theological study. Yet all sciences should be systems more or less complete and consistent. Dependent upon experienced fact and the processes of reason their validity and value must be judged by experience and reason; and in this respect no difference is to be found between Theology and any other science.

The evolution of knowledge depends upon the relation of the individual to society and to history. A science is a social and a historical product: it challenges the individual's acceptance. In comparison with the results already embodied in the traditional systems the effort and achievement of any one man appear insignificant; over against his very limited experience they stand for the experience and reflexion of ages. Nevertheless, small as the contribution of the individual may be, it is only by his challenging past theory in the light of his own life and thought that knowledge progresses. By the patient work of individuals, cooperating with one another, the whole of organized science has been built up. To be a real possession this knowledge must be appropriated by the definite and conscious activity of the individual. Conflict arises and is generally most keen against tradition in matters of Theology, in which the interests of the religious society are concerned. To the individual it is personal conviction that counts: however much weight must be allowed to tradition it is for him to decide whether he will accept it unmodified or modified, or reject it entirely.

II.

A survey of Theology as a science will start with the question: What are the data of Theology? To this question no absolute and complete answer can be given. Like all other sciences it depends for its data upon experience, and as that for us is under the form of time, we are never justified in assuming that we may not meet in future with

data of greater importance than any yet known. To appreciate fully the significance of this truth is of particular importance in Theology, because many have contended that absolute and complete knowledge in this sphere is already possible of recognition. The existence of eternally valid truths, some of which may be already known to man, cannot be denied; but it must be insisted that such truths become known to men at particular points in time, and further, that no science is purely formal, but all depend to some extent upon the data of immediate experience. The data of Theology are obtained from religious experience, by which expression at the outset must be implied what is generally and popularly meant by religion. In the course of scientific investigation the use of the term should become more precise; but to give precision to the term is not one of the objects of the present paper.

What is the aim of Theology? In this, as in almost all studies, there is a search for a purely intellectual satisfaction which should not be underestimated. Nevertheless, the man who studies Theology merely as an intellectual pursuit arouses in us the feeling of insufficiency and poverty. The essential purpose of Theology is to gain an understanding of the religious life and its implications, and to raise it to higher levels through the purifying influence of critical reflexion. The most fruitful study of the subject starts out with the hope of making men more conscious of what religion means; it is not a mere intellectual curiosity, but a broadening of the outlook on life and a deepening of the feelings. The objection is sometimes raised, that if a man has the interests of religion at heart he will be prejudiced in his judgments as to the truth of religious doctrines. To such an objection many replies may be made. An opponent of religion would be just as liable to be prejudiced in his judgments. And, whatever an individual may think to the contrary, it is extremely difficult, if not entirely impossible, to be completely indifferent to the religious attitude. In his actual way of life, if not in his expressed conviction, every man is sympathetic or antagonistic to it: in religion it is true that he who is not with us is against us. To require that the man who studies Theology shall be conscious of its practical significance and shall be sympathetic towards the attitude with which his study is concerned is quite rational and justifiable. It would hardly be too much to say that only the man who has religious experience of his own can really understand the subject-matter and the aim of Theology. Ask a blind man for an adequate treatment of colours and the science of light would be ludicrous. But all this is no reason for the student of Theology not to strive with all his power and with utmost sincerity to find the truth. The search for truth and its admission when found are, in fact, of the deepest essence of religion. But by religion is not to be understood the formal acquiescence in any specific body of doctrines.

Attention may now be turned to the consideration of the scope and methods of theological study. The first task is the description of the nature and the contents of the religious experience. This investigation is mainly analytical, and will refer to the individual and the social aspects of religious life: it may be appropriately called *The Psychology of Religion.* A survey of the religious life of the past, a simple indication from the standpoint of the theory of evolution of the stages through which individuals and societies have come to their religious beliefs and attitudes towards life, is the subject of *The History of Religion.* Allied with these two branches of research is that of *The Comparative Study of Religions*, the purpose of which is to differentiate the aspects of similarity and of difference in the various historical religions. All these sections of Theology are purely empirical, descriptive, and analytic: their task is simply to state what they find; it is not for them to enter upon critical comment as to the worth of the ideas and practices they describe. Hypotheses and theories as to the relationships between religious rites and beliefs, of different religions to one another and to experience in general, may indeed find a place here, but no question is raised as to the truth of the doctrines or the validity of the value-judgments contained in the religious consciousness. To this division of Theology might therefore be applied the term *The Empirical Study of Religion.*

The data thus obtained and systematized must then be submitted to critical examination, with the object of determining the truth and the value of the contents of the religious experience. Such critical examination is not an end in itself, but preparatory to constructive effort. Starting from the descriptive and inferential propositions which are judged valid among those obtained in the

Empirical Study of Religion, the constructive theologian must endeavour to formulate a consistent and comprehensive ideal of the religious life and of its implications. To this critical and synthetical study we give the name of *The Philosophy of Religion*. As such a realm of thought cannot be kept separate from our view of the world in general, the Philosophy of Religion must always bear a close relationship to Philosophy in its widest sense.

Some form of corporate activity and public worship appears to be an inseparable element of religion as found in history, and for the administration and organization of these forms of social expression there has usually been a definite religious ministry. The work of ministering to religious needs and endeavouring to raise men to higher stages of religious life forms a more or less distinct subject of study under the name of *Pastoral Theology*. Concerned with the psychological consideration of religious needs and their most appropriate and justifiable satisfaction, and with the forms most suitable for the expression and cultivation of the religious attitude and experience, it partakes of the nature of an applied science. In so far as it aims at the realization of the highest conception of religion expressed in the Philosophy of Religion, it forms a link between the Empirical Study and the Philosophy of Religion, between the religious life as it now is and what one strives to make it. On the other hand, the experience of pastors in their ministerial functions should lead to contributions to the Psychology of Religion.

The scope of Theology may therefore be outlined as follows:

THEOLOGY.

I. The Empirical Study of Religion.	II. The Philosophy of Religion.
a. The Psychology of Religion (Analytic).	*a*. Critical (Examination of Empirical Data).
b. The History of Religion (Genetic).	*b*. Constructive (Formulation of Ideal System).
c. The Comparative Study of Religions.	

III. Pastoral Theology.

III.

The position indicated in the above outline of the aim, scope, and method of Theology may become more clear by a consideration of some probable objections and questions which it may call forth. Could such a view find a place for Mysticism? One would suppose that what is truly mystical is as such inexplicable, even inexpressible, in theoretical terms. Intellectual expression implies a certain degree of rational comprehension, and challenges critical examination. The mystical element in life cannot be denied: in some form it is real in the experience of every one; but it baffles explanation and theoretical description. Ultimate experiences must be admitted as such: unintelligible sentences do not aid us in realizing any deeper truth in them. How ideas first originate in men's minds is a mystery, and some may come in the experiences of mystics; but it has not yet been shown that the truth or the validity of an idea is at all affected by the nature of its origin. All conceptions which claim a place in Theology must be submitted to critical examination. To argue, as some writers have recently done, that man needs the mystical, and then to label certain doctrines mystical, is not a valid method of removing them from the test of truth. The *raison d'être* of theological creeds is that they give a meaning to and indicate a value in life which otherwise it would not appear to have; it is just in so far as they make man's existence more intelligible than it would be without them that they are of importance. The truly mystical commences where thought is inadequate—in a realm beyond ideas and theoretical expression. What passes as Mysticism is often nothing else but the ordinary theological doctrines expressed with fervour and strong religious emotion. The writings of the mystics will provide a considerable amount of material for psychological investigation and philosophical reflexion, but apart from their intrinsic religious worth thus found, they cannot rightly be regarded as possessing any especially authoritative character of their own. As a stimulus to the feelings, in private and public worship, the importance of mystical and devotional literature cannot be overestimated.

The proposed scheme of Theology omits specific reference to several studies which are usually regarded as falling within its sphere. These are in the main concerned with philological questions and must be carried on in accordance with the general principles and methods of philology. The study of the books of the Old and the New Testaments in the original must conform to the same standards as the study of any other writings

'sacred' or 'profane.' This is now generally admitted amongst scholars, but in practice these philological researches are far too often influenced by previously formed theological views, and the possible bearing of the philological conclusion upon Theology is allowed to determine the attitude to important questions. For the Empirical Study of Religion it is necessary to find the real significance of the Scriptures, but there is no adequate reason that our religious beliefs shall be identical with those therein contained. Philological questions are the task of philological scholars: theological students should seek essentially to understand the nature and the requirements of the religious life.

Comment may be made in more conservative circles upon the fact that we have not recognized the distinction usually made between Natural and Revealed Religion, a distinction often thought to be fundamental for Theology. To the thought of to-day, as contrasted with that of the eighteenth century, this distinction is really little more than a verbal one. All knowledge is in some sense natural and all in some sense revealed. The object known, whether material or spiritual, human or divine, is known only because it stands in an active relationship with the mind that knows. The mind never experiences a purely passive object: it knows only because its activity meets with some resistance. In thought which is true, man does not think just what he wishes but what he must; what the nature of reality compels him to think. It is the same with regard to the knowledge of the spiritual as it is of that of the material world. All religious experience, if valid, and not simply transitory subjective feeling, is in the end a relationship between active beings. God revealing Himself to men is God in active relation with men. Religious knowledge from the side of man is natural, and from the side of God is revealed. This revelation takes many forms—through the religious feelings which Nature arouses in us, and more especially through the history and the moral and the religious consciousness of humanity. Religion is now admitted as a normal characteristic of human life, and whatever its apparent immediate source, all genuine religion is ultimately a fellowship between the individual in his social condition and the divine; so that all Theology is in this sense natural.

In the place of the above discussed distinction modern thought insists upon that between the knowledge of God obtained through external nature on the one hand, and that obtained through the moral and spiritual life of man on the other. And, as in earlier times Revealed Religion was thought of as superior to Natural Religion, so now the knowledge of God which comes through human moral and religious experience is held to transcend that derived from the world of nature. For Revealed Religion the central point was the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and modern Theology still finds itself forced to admit that He is the greatest religious personality of the race, and that in His life and teaching He is supreme in the revelation of the divine amongst men.

It may also be asked in what manner the term 'Christian Theology' might be used. Christian Theology is a definite portion of Theology. For data it has the religious experience of Christians, and in this, most especially, all that has been felt and thought of Jesus Christ. It will trace the history of Christianity, and will critically examine its doctrines and practices in the endeavour to present in its best form the religious outlook of the Christian faith. Scientific Theology cannot admit *a priori* any superiority of worth in the Christian view of life: examination may show that it has truth and value not to be found in any other religion; but this may not be assumed at the outset. As a religion and as an implicated Theology, Christianity must establish its precedence before the bar of rational reflexion and the moral and religious consciousness. But it cannot be adequately understood and appreciated apart from the general History of Religion, and Theology cannot consider it as other than a distinct type of religious life, and therefore as a subject of examination under all the sections of the proposed scheme.

In the immediate future it seems probable that men generally will make a distinction, though not with full consciousness, between Christian Theology and the Theology of Jesus. The Synoptic Gospels give as a general impression a picture of Jesus of Nazareth which still makes a very strong appeal to all sorts and conditions of men. The doctrines which the Church has developed concerning Him often fail to attract even where they do not arouse actual opposition. For a life of religious experience such as that of Jesus, it will be urged that no other Theology than His is

needed. A man may say: The religious attitude of Jesus and His disciples so appeals to me that on the authority of this appeal and the influence of His character, I accept for my own life the fundamental religious doctrines which He held. Some of the traits in the personality and some of the elements in the teaching, as, *e.g.*, the merely eschatological ones, he will put down to temporary and transitory causes, and will discard them. But the essential attitude of Jesus Himself, as distinct from what are obviously the statements of others about Him, he will adopt as his own attitude. The theological student may find difficulties in the position; but to the masses of mankind it will present a simple creed, higher than which they have not been given and sanctified by a personality and a life which never lose their charm or authority.

IV.

Of the many questions that might still be raised two only can be referred to in the present paper. At the outset of this discussion the claim for absolute freedom in theological research was made. Except among a few scholars attached to free religious bodies, such freedom has never existed in the Christian Churches in the past, and it does not exist to-day. Almost all theological students —including most Professors of Divinity—are officially attached to ecclesiastical organizations, to hold any position in which subscription to specific statements of doctrine is demanded. Even where some liberty of interpretation is allowed, prevailing circumstances lead thinkers to turn their attention to subjects less likely to cause discussion, or to express themselves in a manner which hides their position from all but the theological expert. What is required for advance in Theology is the same as has been demanded for other sciences in the past: the main activities of men under no restriction whatever as to the methods of their investigation, the sources of their data, and the statements of their results. If it is not possible that such scholars should be attached officially to definite religious bodies, other provision should be made for them, just as for any other branch of study in a university. Faculties of Theology should be quite free, and in the interest of thought and religion itself no one should be allowed to occupy a Chair of Divinity who holds any position which requires definite adherence to prescribed doctrines. If the various ecclesiastical bodies desire to give theological instruction on their own peculiar principles, that is essentially a concern of their own, but if—as we believe—it is becoming generally recognized that the possession of religious truth is of at least as much importance as that of ethics, history, and such branches of knowledge, there should be provision for its untrammelled investigation. The cause of religion demands it. Upon liberty of theological thought depends ultimately the question of religious reunion; for truth is one, and will make men free from the errors and trivialities which divide them. It is hardly possible to overestimate the power which a united Christendom—or even a united Protestantism—would have in the world; and yet reunion is directly prevented by the demands made of religious ministers, which hinder their search for and statement of truth.

This subject cannot be left without some reference to the training of candidates for the religious ministry. Assuming in the first place a sound general education, it has never to be lost sight of, that the purpose of the training is not to produce theologians, but to equip men for the particular occupation of *ministering* to the religious *life*. The theological course therefore should be the widest possible, including the three sections, the Empirical Study of Religion, the Philosophy of Religion, and Pastoral Theology. Far too much time is spent in most of our theological colleges and divinity halls in philological studies, which have not even a secondary value for the ministerial office; and an entirely wrong sense of proportion is thus cultivated at a most important time in the minister's life. Considering the education of its ministers, it says much for the vitality of the Christian religion that it has achieved the success which it has already met with; and if present-day Christians would give themselves up whole-heartedly to the pursuit of truth, the whole world might be won over to it.

Yet, however wide the range of theological study, it is in itself inadequate for the training of the pastor, whose task is to endeavour to satisfy spiritual needs. However reverently presented, scientific Theology is still essentially theoretical, and here more is required. The fervour of the religious geniuses of the race must be felt: the spirit of the saints of the past must be entered into by a quiet and regular perusal of the devotional and mystical literature of ages which are gone.

Further, a consideration of the moral and religious problems of contemporary life is, one would suppose, an essential factor in a minister's training; but it is almost universally neglected.

A religious body is primarily a society of persons united to live the religious life. In and for this life ideas and beliefs are necessary. But although individual and often quite opposed religious bodies have made the claim to be especially and uniquely guided by God in their practices and beliefs, there seems to be no reliable evidence to justify the claim. Nevertheless, a Church as a teaching institution must have something definite to teach, and the learner must in the first place receive his instruction on authority. Dogmatic instruction does not, however, constitute the most important part of education, whether religious or secular; the pupil requires also to learn how to test for himself so-called knowledge, and how to acquire new experience. Of more importance than the acquiescence in certain formulations of religious conceptions is the cultivation of the attitude of honesty and sincerity in the search for religious truth. And if the sheep of the flock are ever to determine their lives on this principle, it must first be conformed to by the shepherds, and by none more than by those who occupy themselves with the scientific study of Theology.

In the Study.

A Study in Christian Experience.

By Rev. James H. Hodson, B.D., Lytham.

'The Spirit and the flesh.'—Gal 5^{16-25}.

The central theme of this great passage in the Epistle to the Galatians is the conflict waged in the believer's heart between the Spirit of God and the flesh (v.^{17}). The strife differs from that described in Ro 7, which depicts the experience of St. Paul whilst still 'carnal' (v.^{14}). The former passage refers to the Spirit-led life; the latter to the self-controlled one. It is only as we contrast these two passages that the real meaning and glory of the Christian experience portrayed in Galatians become manifest. Our purpose is to attempt to set forth this contrast in its salient features.

I. The Combatants.

In Gal 5^{16-25} these are the 'Spirit,' *i.e.* the Holy Ghost indwelling the regenerate soul, and 'the flesh,' *i.e.* the principle of sin in man's fallen nature. This evil principle sometimes shows its 'works' or 'doings' in sins connected with the body, 'fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, drunkenness, revellings' (vv.$^{19.\ 21}$), and as this type of sin is the more obvious it gives the name of 'flesh' to the evil bias. But the sinful inclination is also shown in evils connected with the intellect, as 'idolatry, sorcery, factions, divisions, heresies,' or with the emotions, as 'enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, envyings' (vv.$^{20.\ 21}$). The 'flesh' is in direct antagonism to the Divine Spirit, as is the 'Spirit' to 'the flesh' (v.^{17}): 'the mind of the flesh is enmity against God' (Ro 8^{7}). This duel may go on even in the regenerate nature as is presupposed in the passage before us, for it is addressed to those who are 'sons' of God (4^{6}). That this inner strife is a reality God's children know only too well (1 Jn 1^{8}): in their new life they find both peace and war.

'In every soul that shall be saved is a Godly Will that never assented to sin, nor ever shall. Right as there is a beastly will in the lower part that may will no good, right so there is a Godly Will in the higher part, which will is so good that it may never will evil, but ever good.'—Julian of Norwich, *Revelations of Divine Love*, 1373 A.D.

'As to the habitual temper of my mind I find a principle within me opposing and striving against indwelling corruption and sin of all kinds.'—Sarah Gilchrist in *Revivals of the Eighteenth Century*.

'In referring to one of his brother's hymns in which occur the words, "I wrestle not now, but trample on sin," John Wesley remarked, "So says my brother, but not I."'—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, March 1913.

In Ro 7 the contending forces in this conflict are different: on one side is 'the inward man' (v.^{22}), or the real self, the 'I' (v.^{17}), or 'the law of my mind' (v.^{23}); and on the other, 'sin which dwelleth in me' (v.^{17}), or 'the law of sin which is in my members' (v.^{23}). Thus the combatants here are the higher nature which links us to God,

which, speaking generally, we may call conscience, and the lower nature which is the seat of sinful and sensual passions. The higher nature delights in the law of God (v.[22]) and would fain serve it (v.[25]), but the lower nature binds the 'wretched man' in captivity to sin (v.[23]). In one sense the aspiration of the higher nature towards good is the work of the Spirit of God, who is the Author of 'every virtue we possess.' To follow our highest intuitions is to be 'led of the Spirit.' But here His operation is rather that of the Spirit who convicts 'in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement' (Jn 16[8]), working upon the heart, than that of the Spirit welcomed into the heart as an Almighty Ally, as a regenerating force. What the apostle depicts as his own experience has been felt by universal man, who has ever had to confess that seeing the right he yet does the wrong. It is specifically the experience of a man who is under conviction of his guilt and is penitent, but who has not learned the evangelical secret of victory. As between the combatants here described the strife is unequal, and can only end in defeat. Of itself the 'mind' is often unable to discern the right, and when it sees the true course is easily swayed by passion or self-interest to palliate the evil. If it cannot thus deceive itself it is inherently feeble and quickly pulled down into the slime of sin. The conflict is between a giant and a dwarf. But when, as in the case described in Gal 5, we 'live by the Spirit' (v.[25]), when 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' has made us 'free from the law of sin and of death' (Ro 8[2]), all the advantage is on our side as we fight against the 'flesh.' Then we are 'strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man' (Eph 3[16]). Our sinful nature is brought face to face with God as its antagonist. Reinforced by Almighty power we are more than conquerors. Sure of deliverance from sin's thraldom we cry triumphantly, 'I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord' (Ro 7[25]).

II. The Conflict.

As we have already seen, the 'flesh' is the dominant force in the spiritual duel described in Ro 7: the higher nature is 'sold under sin' (v.[14]); the better self is even compelled to do what it hates (v.[15]); sin reigns in the soul. The truth of this account is seen luridly in the lives of wicked men, but it is also a fact that sin has dominion in every unrenewed heart, either as ingratitude to a loving God, or as selfishness towards man, or as impotence for holiness: self is the master-passion.

'I experienced within me as the conflict of two armies—the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh. Even when my lusts had been subdued, so as to seem trampled under foot, I found them stealing upon me anew, and drawing away my heart from God and from matters of duty. . . . I discovered in me a lusting after things sinful which I had not power to overcome. I became persuaded that unless the Lord would undertake for me, and work all my works in me and for me, I would not succeed in doing anything to purpose.'—Elizabeth Dykes in *Revivals of the Eighteenth Century*.

But in the conflict set forth in Gal 5 the 'flesh' is no longer regnant: its 'dominion' is ended; it has been 'crucified with the passions and lusts thereof' (v.[24]).

'Christ was crucified in the likeness of sinful flesh: "they that are Christ's" crucify the very reality. It was the first act of their new and regenerate life. They deliberately, thoughtfully, thankfully delivered to death the remainder of their evil. Every Christian must have his own Calvary, his own cross set up in the secret shrine of the soul, and crucify there, and keep crucified until crucifixion ends in death, all that belongs to his flesh with 'its affections and lusts.'—W. B. Pope, D.D.

How great the contrast between the 'flesh' as reigning and the 'flesh' as crucified! How crippled its baleful power! Doubtless it makes many efforts to wrench its limbs from the cross and to come down to regain its sway over the believer. He is conscious of its writhings, and needs to put out his strength to keep it fixed on the cross. The cravings of the sensual 'lusts' are only tamed by stern measures. 'It is a greater labour to resist vices and passions than to toil at bodily labours' (A'Kempis). But the more subtle 'affections' of the 'flesh,' its pride, its wilfulness, its rebellion against chastisement, its self-seeking, are only excised by a keen knife that goes near to life itself.

General Gordon was requested to go to the Soudan, much against his will, as he was in conversation with a friend. A look of anger passed quite visibly over his face. On recovering himself he said to his friend, 'That was self, which I am daily trying to kill.'

Despite the severity of the struggle, the 'flesh' cannot prevail over the child of God, for the power which binds it is that of the Holy Spirit. True self-mortification is really the operation of the indwelling Spirit of God.

'Though we have crucified our flesh to keep it bound to the cross, it is not the rigour of our ascetic severity that destroys "the body of sin." It is the breath of the Holy Ghost which withers the fruits of evil in our nature; and it is His condemning word that blights the tree of evil in us unto its root. We must not doubt that He will finish in this life the work He has begun in us. The Holy Ghost, we may hope, will cry over our crucified flesh, with all its affections and lusts stilled and extinguished for ever, "It is finished."'—W. B. Pope, D.D.

III. The Conditions.

There is a glorious change in the atmosphere in which the inward conflict is carried on before and after the soul's acceptance of the sanctifying Spirit. The difference is in regard to the soul's relation to 'the law.' In Ro 7 the soul, prior to its discharge (v.[6]), is under the 'dominion' of the law, 'holden' in bondage by it (v.[6]), condemned to death by it (vv.[9-11]). The better nature tries to order life by the law, to meet its demands, only to discover its own powerlessness and to incur the inevitable penalty (v.[10]; Gal 3[10-12]). The interior strife is waged amid deep gloom, until there is conscious emancipation from the law.

'After the unforgiven sinner has done his utmost he feels that he has not fulfilled that law of God which is so straight, and so unbending just because it must be straight. Climb as he may the height of perfection he sees the summit rising still above him, wrapped in darkness and lurid with flame. After he has made some great exertion he looks to the law to see if it will give him a smile of approbation, and he beholds only a darkening frown upon its face.'—Dr. M'Cosh, *Method of the Divine Government.*

'By my continued endeavour to keep His whole law, inward and outward, to the utmost of my power, I was persuaded that I should be accepted of Him and that I was even then in a state of salvation. . . . I diligently strove against all sin. I omitted no sort of self-denial which I thought lawful. I carefully used both in public and private all the means of grace at all opportunities; I omitted no occasion of doing good. All this I knew to be nothing, unless it was directed towards inward holiness. Yet when, after continuing some years in this course I apprehended myself to be near death, I could not find that all this gave me any comfort or any assurance of acceptance with God. At this I was then not a little surprised, not imagining I had been all this time building on the sand.'—*J. Wesley's Journal*, vol. i. p. 468, Stand. ed.

But subsequent to the new life in the Spirit the inner battle is fought under a sunny sky. The believer is 'not now under the law' (Gal 5[18]): he does right not because he must, but because it is his joy to do God's will; he is not driven by external commands but 'led by the Spirit' (v.[18]); he obeys God out of the spontaneous impulse of a loving heart. God's statutes become his songs. Thus practising the virtues of the new life in Christ he can have no sense of God's displeasure: against the graces of the Spirit 'there is no law' (v.[23]); there can be no Divine disapproval of a holy life, and so he is habitually conscious of God's smile. Should any shadow at the memory of his past sin, any inadvertent lapse at the present, cloud the heavens, he penitently remembers that 'there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus' (Ro 8[1. 2]). How much easier it is now to fight the good fight of faith! The debt of unforgiven sin lifted from his conscience, the hitherto impossible task turned into an 'easy yoke,' he girds himself for every struggle with inbred sin conscious of his new resources in the Spirit, and joyful in the hope of complete victory: he is a 'happy warrior.'

IV. The Conquest.

The issue of the unequal strife in Ro 7 is the defeat of the higher nature, of the nobler intuitions. This is frankly confessed (vv.[15. 18. 19]). With clear views of the folly of sin the penitent still commits it. He is carried down the tide against his desire and convictions. 'To-day he weeps over his sins, and, before he is aware of it, he is rejoicing in iniquity to-morrow. In a brief excitement he rises a little above his habitual level of earthliness, but he cannot soar to the heavenly regions of purity and peace: if he seek, Icarus-like, to mount by earthly means, his flight may only make his fall the more lamentable: his carnal thoughts and feelings, like noxious weeds, cut down in one quarter, speedily spring up in another' (Dr. M'Cosh). At last the cry is wrung from his weary heart: 'O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?' (Ro 7[24]).

'In this vile, abject state of bondage to sin I was indeed fighting continually, but not conquering. Before, I had willingly served sin: now it was unwillingly; but still I served it. I fell, and rose, and fell again. Sometimes I was overcome, and in heaviness: sometimes I overcame, and was in joy.'—*John Wesley's Journal*, vol. i. p. 476, Stand. ed.

'When Henry Reed realized his wonderful escape from death he wept with gratitude to God, and solemnly vowed that from that moment he would be a Christian. He threw his brandy bottle and pack of cards into the sea, and made a public declaration that he would henceforth live to God. He exerted all his will-power, depending on his own strength

of purpose, and did his best. But he soon found that sin was deeply seated in his inner being and held him in bondage, so that the evil he would not was just the thing he did.'—*Autobiography of William Taylor of California.*

In his ballad entitled 'Cells,' Kipling describes the lamentation of a soldier imprisoned for drunkenness, and penitent enough. Outside are his weeping wife and child, but the drink-lust is on him, and in his heart he owns, 'I know I'll do it again!'

The conflict portrayed in Gal 5^{16-25} is one of habitual victory over evil. Walking 'by the Spirit' the regenerate man does 'not fulfil the lust of the flesh' (v.[16]). The purpose of 'the flesh' is that he 'may not' (R.V. v.[17]) do the things that he would as prompted by the Spirit. There is no 'cannot' in the case as in A.V. On the contrary, indwelt by the Spirit, he 'can do all things in him that strengtheneth' him (Ph 4^{13}). '*When we were in the flesh*, the sinful passions, which were through the law, wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But *now* we have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were holden: so that we *serve in newness of the spirit*' (Ro $7^{5.6}$).

'I was much buffeted with temptations; but cried out, and they fled away. They returned again and again. I as often lifted up my eyes, and He "sent me help from His holy place." And herein I found the difference between this and my former state chiefly consisted. I was striving, yea, fighting with all my might under the law, as well as under grace. But then I was sometimes, if not often, conquered. Now, I was always conqueror.'—*John Wesley's Journal*, vol. i. p. 477, Stand. ed.

'I was, however, enabled to look to the Lord in faith for grace to conquer these strong lusts and corruptions, and as I thus looked to Him I became stronger, and they became weaker.'—E. Dykes in *Revivals of the Eighteenth Century.*

'Thou holdest my soul In spiritual life,
My foes dost control, And quiet their strife:
Thou rulest my passion, My pride and self-will;
To see Thy salvation, Thou bidd'st me "Stand still!"'
Charles or John Wesley.

V. The Secret of Victory over Sin.

The source of spiritual triumph implied throughout Gal 5^{16-25} is clearly revealed in the injunction—'Walk by the Spirit' (vv[16. 25]). 'We live by the Spirit': our spiritual life depends on Him as our physical life does on the air. It is as we are inspired, guided, filled, 'by the Spirit' that we overcome every influence of 'the flesh' (Ro 8^{2}). We walk 'by the Spirit' in the proportion in which we 'walk by faith,' *i.e.* 'utter dependence upon the life-communicating Christ.' Such faith, as at the beginning of the Christian life, is the required thing to its close. 'The faith which works conversion accomplishes sanctification' (H. W. Clark, *D.D.*). Oneness of our life with Christ's through His Spirit by faith is the only source of abiding Christ-likeness. It cannot be otherwise. It is suggested by the apostle (Gal 6^{14}) that the believer's conquest of the internal enemy 'the flesh' may be extended to a triumph over the external one 'the world': there is possible such a mutual crucifixion, 'the world unto me, and I unto the world,' that no intercommunion can take place! Such complete victory is distinctly ascribed to faith (1 Jn $5^{4.5}$).

'A sincere spirit of legalism, more than anything else prevented the Holy Spirit from perfecting that which was lacking in my faith. It was not theoretical but practical legalism. I did not for a moment trust to anything I had done, but under cover of vows and covenants to be holy I was really trusting in what I was going to do. . . . I worked myself nearly to death trying to be holy. In August 1845, on my way to a camp-meeting I saw that . . . I should pay no particular attention to my emotional sensibilities nor to their changes . . . but should simply accept the Bible record of God's provisions and promises as an adequate basis of faith . . . and receive and trust the Divine Saviour for all that He had come to do for me, and nothing less. I was then and there enabled to establish two essential facts: (1) to be true to Jesus Christ; (2) to receive and trust Him to be true to me. So there, on my horse in the road, I began to say more emphatically than ever before "I belong to God. Every fibre of my being I consecrate to Him. I consent to perfect obedience. I have no power to do anything towards saving myself, but in utter helplessness I receive and trust Jesus for full salvation." I went on, maintaining my two facts as the Lord gave me power to do, without the aid of joyous feeling. One evening at the meeting I said to a saintly woman, "In the years of my unbelief and apostasy I acquired such a habit of doubting that I have never been able fully to conquer it." Instantly the taunt of the tempter rang through the domain of my spirit-nature: "Can't! you can't do it!" I saw I had inadvertently made a concession which Satan was using to defeat my faith: I said to her, "God commands us to believe and be saved. He does not command impossibilities; so I have said, 'I can't believe' for the last time. I can do whatsoever He commands, for He hath said, 'My grace is sufficient for thee.'" I at once revised my spiritual vocabulary and ignored all the "can'ts," "ifs," "buts," in regard to the grand possibilities of the grace of God. That was a victory for my faith, but I felt no cleansing power within. One sleepless night in a moment the oft-repeated fact went through me like an electric shock, "With God all things are possible." I rested my weary soul on the bosom of Jesus, and saw spread out before me an ocean of available soul-saving resources in God, and overheard the whispers of the Holy Spirit, "Jesus saves you; He saves you now." I was fully

united to Him in the bonds of mutual fidelity, confidence, and love. I have from that day to this dwelt with Jesus, and verified the truth of the record of God concerning His Son.' —*Autobiography of William Taylor of California.*

When the soul is thus made free from the control of inbred sin the ground is cleared for the growth of 'fruit unto holiness' (Ro 6^{22}). The lusts of the flesh, which, like thorns, choked the good seed, are rooted up. Beneath His gentle, vivifying influences 'the fruit of the Spirit' (Gal $5^{22.\ 23}$), lovingly, faithfully tended, grows apace in the cleansed heart, even a hundredfold, to the glory of the abounding grace of God.

'O God, deliver us from earthly desires, that no sin may reign in us, but that we may with free spirits serve Thee, our only Lord: through Jesus Christ. Amen.'—*Gelasian Sacramentary*, 492 A.D.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

June Evenings.

'In the cool of the day.'—Gn 3^{8}.

I wonder what part of the day you, boys and girls, like best, in this lovely month of June. I knew a little girl who went to spend a June afternoon and evening at the home of one of her companions. They played about the garden, enjoying themselves amongst the flowers. The time slipped past very quickly: my little friend could scarcely believe her ears when she heard ten o'clock strike. It was still daylight, and not a breath of wind was blowing. 'How lovely,' she said to herself; 'this is the time of year I like best. Think of being out till past bed-time.'

That was only a little girl speaking; but I believe that many old men, and old women, and grown-up young people as well, have loved summer evenings. The writer of Genesis loved them. Read his stories, and you will discover this for yourselves. He must have been a learned man with a beautiful mind; and when he wrote this wonderful book I do not think he could have been very old.

Isaac, he tells us, went out to meditate *at eventide*. If Isaac had lived in the days of our fathers or grandfathers, I believe we should have had volumes upon volumes of his poetry. There is no time one feels the fragrance of field flowers more than on an evening in early summer. You know the scent that a clover field has then, do you not? I would not venture to say that there were clover fields where Isaac took his evening walk; but when he was old and blind, receiving savoury meat, such as he loved, from the hands of Jacob, he blessed him, and said:

See, the smell of my son
Is as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed.

And do you remember another Genesis story that tells of an evening scene at a well? It is in my mind like a picture. A beautiful young woman comes to draw water. She meets an old man at the well, to whom she gives drink; she draws water for his camels also. Then he presents her with ear-rings and bracelets. When she took the old man to her home, she discovered that it was not a mere matter of getting presents, it was a story with God in it. You know it, don't you?

Then take your text. God Himself walked in the garden *in the cool of the day*. Many of you have, I daresay, been in some of the lovely Botanic Gardens of our big cities, or better still in the wide country on a June evening. Wasn't there a wonderful stillness about? You could hear the birds singing here and there, but very softly; even the friend beside you was more silent than usual. That was the sort of evening the writer of Genesis knew, but with this difference—there was a slight, a very slight breeze blowing. He pictured the Garden of Eden for us as a place of perfect happiness, because there was no doing what was wrong in it—there was no sin; and the Lord God Himself walked there in the cool of the day.

I believe that we in this country have even more beautiful evenings, than the people who live where the Garden of Eden is supposed to have been. They are nearly always cool, and we can go out and enjoy them when there is not a breath of wind. But the picture of Eden's perfect happiness is one I want you all to remember. A lady friend told me of having spent her summer holidays in Morayshire in the north of Scotland. 'The evenings were almost too good to be true,' she said. She went on to tell me of one in particular, and quoted:

'Twas like an eve in a sinless world.'

I wonder if any of you bigger boys or girls could find out for me where those words were taken from. Try; and if you are successful, send the name of the author or authoress to me.

I scarcely think any of us value that glimpse of the Garden of Eden as we ought to. God is good in letting us have it. As I said, what made the happiness of Eden perfect was the fact that those who lived there had hearts without sin. But God's goodness and love followed Adam and Eve when they were driven out of Paradise. There was still the cool of the evening. My boys and girls, I have known a poor woman in Edinburgh (a really poor woman remember—she did not know where her next shilling was to come from) say a little prayer to her Heavenly Father, because He had made her home in such a fair city. It is 'beautiful for situation,' and like the June evenings in Morayshire, those of Edinburgh seem almost too good to be real.

If we have clean hearts, boys and girls—and you know where to get them—we can be very very happy in this world.

Here are a few verses about the Maker of it:

God made the country,
Man made the town,
God clad the country
In a green gown.

Poor folks from Eden
Driven away,
God made the country
For a holiday.

God gave the country
A flower, a bird,
To comfort His children
For the flaming sword.

For easing and pleasing
He made a tree,
Many a sweet rivulet,
Dew and the bee.

God made the country,
Man made the town,
Is not God a maker
Of great renown.[1]

And on these lovely summer evenings, you may still have Him walking beside you as your friend.

II.

Paul Do-a-Thing.

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Paisley.

'This one thing I do.'—Ph 3[13].

A curious mistake was made at the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance which met in Aberdeen some time ago. The Rev. Dr. Burrell of New York, the President, wishing no doubt to have some local colour in his opening address, some local reference that might add to its interest, had been searching the annals of Aberdeen, and had come across something which he thought might be suitable. He said, 'In the archives of the Royal Burgh of Aberdeen mention is made of a certain David Anderson, who lived in the seventeenth century, who had much to do with making it an enterprising and well-built town. Its churches, factories, fisheries, public markets, and seats of learning, he had a hand in them all. And because of that busy hand he came to be familiarly known as Davie Do-ă-thing.' And the speaker went on to say, 'Would that the spirit of Davie Do-ă-thing might appear in this Council, urging us to undertake great things for God and to expect great things from Him.'

Well, it was a very appropriate application of the reference in that sense, but a smile came over the faces of some of his hearers—the Scotchmen amongst them—for they recognized at once that he had made a slight mistake—a slight mistake in the accent—but one that implied a considerable difference in meaning from that which he had brought out. They saw that the real pronunciation was not Davie Do-ă-thing but Davie Do-ā'-thing. Dr. Burrell in his ignorance of Scotch had interpreted it wrongly. The name had not been given altogether in the way of praise, but had been applied by his fellow-citizens in a kind of amusing, and possibly somewhat contemptuous sense, to a man who had been noted for having his finger in every pie, so to speak.

But I think we might truly apply the phrase in both ways to St. Paul, though in his case both in a good sense. He was Paul Do-ă-thing, and he was also in a remarkable way Paul Do-ā'-thing—all things. In the following chapter of this Epistle he says, 'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.' Elsewhere he says, 'I am made all things to all men that I might by all means save some.' More than any other of the Apostles, Paul recognized the boundless scope of the Christian life, and the greatness of our possessions in Christ Jesus.

(1) Notice, first, the concentration in Paul's life, 'This one thing I do.' His was a very varied life, full of changes bright and sad. He was a great traveller, ever meeting new faces, fresh experiences,

[1] K. Tynan, *Irish Poems*.

working now at tent-making to pay his way and not be burdensome, again speaking to an assembly hanging upon his words, often facing an angry mob, in prison often. But throughout it all these words were true of him, 'This one thing I do.'

And that spirit of concentration applies to everything in life. It is true in business. Dr. Carnegie, who has been successful enough in that line, gives it as his opinion, founded on the observation of many years, that the failures of young business men are largely due to lack of concentration. If you dissipate your energies on a score of things, you are not likely to have much success in any of them. You will be like the man who has told that as a boy he was fond of music and wanted to be able to play every instrument. He tried the piano, harmonium, melodeon, violin, and flute, with the result, as he said, that, as a man, he can only play one instrument—the penny whistle. You must concentrate on one thing or another if you are ever to attain any measure of excellence.

Above all, in religion, if it is to bring us any real comfort and strength, it must be no half-hearted affair. Our heart must be truly in it, else it will only be a weary burden. It is no marvel that his Christianity should be the one thing in Paul's life when we know what it had done for him and how dear it was to him.

(2) But his was no narrow and meagre life in consequence of this one thing. It had been a poor and contracted kind of life in his pharisaic days, bigoted and prejudiced enough then. But he had been delivered from all that. He had been brought into a large place in Christ Jesus.

Speaking of Aberdeen, a place well known to me, there is a fund for the repair and upkeep of the Bridge of Don near the city—the new bridge, new at least as compared with the historic old bridge about a quarter of a mile away. This fund seems to have accumulated in the course of the years considerably beyond the needs of the bridge. The trustees of the fund wondered what they could do with some of the surplus money. They could not give it to any object outside the original purpose of the fund. They must use it within the limits of the trust. At last they solved the difficulty in an ingenious way by applying it to the repair not only of the bridge, but also of the *approaches* to the bridge. They put a generous interpretation upon the application of the fund, and yet one that still associated it with the bridge. How much the term—the approaches to the bridge—includes at either end I am unable to say.

But is not that something like Paul's interpretation of his mission and message in the name of Jesus? And was it not the way in which Jesus Himself spake of all that was done for Him? 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' That was a far-reaching approach to Him.

Mungo Park was seen one day throwing stones into the river Tweed. A friend who came upon him while thus employed said, 'That seems a poor occupation for one who has gone so far and done so much.' And then the great traveller explained. 'I was measuring,' said he, 'the depth by the time it took for the bubbles to come to the surface. I have found that very helpful many a time in my journeys.' So it was no mere purposeless waste of time in what seemed a childish occupation. There was method in it all. It had a meaning and a relationship to the main work of his life when understood in the right light. It was of a piece with the whole. In that sense he could have said with the apostle, 'This one thing I do.'

But there is nothing equal to the spirit of life in Christ for the wide and varied field of interest that may be embraced within its scope. Nothing is outside it that concerns human welfare. Paul's 'one thing' did not dwarf or starve his life in any way. His life had become rich in fellowship and friendship with all classes of people. He could write a charming letter to Philemon on behalf of a runaway slave. He had already won the heart of Philemon, the wealthy master, but none the less was he concerned about the forlorn creature who had come to him in his trouble. And even in emergencies, such as the shipwreck on his way to Rome, when all the others had lost their head, Paul stands out the one practical man among them, and through his presence of mind all were brought safely to land. In these, and in all the countless incidents of his widely varied life, Paul was ever acting up to his great motto, 'This one thing I do.'

Should we not learn from him something of the infinite scope of true religion and of the Master's service? We may live in heavenly places in the humblest spheres of life. There is a picture by a Dutch artist representing the interior of a kitchen, and the figure in the picture is that of an angel handling the pots and pans, and doing all the work

connected with the situation. It is not difficult to see what the artist intended to convey by his picture—that the high calling of God in Christ Jesus may be fulfilled in the commonest surroundings; that wherever our lot is cast, if the right spirit possess us, our service may be equal to that of the angels in the sight of the great Lord and Master of us all, and that, just as truly as the apostle in the greater sphere assigned to him, we may live up to the motto, 'This one thing I do.'

III.

"'The Conscience Clock.'

By the Rev. J. Strahan McKee, M.A., London.

I wonder if you boys and girls read the newspapers. Perhaps some of you saw a little piece in the *Evening News* the other day about 'The Clocks of London Bridge.' This is at any rate what I read:

'A man in khaki leisurely walking over London Bridge this morning looked at his watch and saw that it had stopped. He asked a passer-by what the time was, and got the reply, "Oh, about half-past ten." Somewhat astonished he sought to get a glimpse of public clocks in the neighbourhood.

'On a large insurance office was the face of a clock without hands; a few yards away another large clock said half-past two. He then glanced at a shop clock, which said twenty-minutes past seven. The clock outside the Canadian Pacific Company's offices at the corner of King William Street stood at half-past six, and the London and Lancashire Assurance Company's clock, a few doors away, made the time twelve o'clock, though whether midnight or midday was an open question.'

And lastly, and worst of all, 'The hands of a church clock in Cannon Street pointed to ten minutes past ten. And as the fool in the forest said very sagely it was ten o'clock!'

What, I asked myself, could have happened to all these London clocks? Is this terrible war, as people say, really and truly putting back the hands of the clock? Or were they merely getting their annual spring-cleaning? I could not possibly tell. But one thing I do know, and that is that some boys, and girls too, set their own clocks wrong on purpose.

How, you ask, could they do this when they have not got such things as clocks which they can call their own? But I am sure they have! You young people are very pleased, are you not, when you become the proud owners of watches, and cannot help taking them out of your pockets every five minutes to look at them. Well, boys and girls, our Heavenly Father has given to each one of us a splendid present of a clock which we carry about with us wherever we go. It is called a conscience. It does not say, Tick! Tock! Tick! Tock!—but, Yes! No! Yes! No! Right! Wrong! Right! Wrong! and if you do not treat it very well it stops.

Now there are three things about this most wonderful conscience clock that I would like you always to remember. You must do so if you want it to keep in order, for the works are very delicate.

Firstly, it is an eight-day clock. You know what that means? It must be wound up very carefully every eight days, if it is not to run down. I remember when I was a boy I held the very responsible position of winding up the dining-room clock every Sunday morning. I don't think I ever forgot to do so. This is just what we have all come to church to do this Sunday morning. We pray and we sing to God. This is how we wind up our conscience clocks.

Secondly, it is a clock which needs to be regulated at certain times. It may go too fast or too slow. The dust that flies about in the streets and playfields and school-rooms may get into the inside. Easter, Christmas, or Communion Seasons are the best times to regulate our conscience clocks, that is, to find out what they have gained or lost. The Bible says, you know, 'Let a man examine himself.'

Thirdly, it is an alarm clock. You will, perhaps, understand better what this means when you are a little older. Though some of you may have already heard the alarm. If one forgets about God and becomes careless and does many wicked deeds and falls asleep in sin, then some day, suddenly, the alarm rings out—'Awake to righteousness, and sin not!' God Himself sets the alarm to awaken us before it is too late.

Boys and girls, do learn to treat your conscience clocks well and they will keep good time and never stop, and God will be very pleased that you are so careful of His splendid gifts. Above all, never forget to do your best to keep them right to the minute by 'looking unto Jesus' every day of the week. He is always ready to help you to 'get right with God' if you but ask Him.

IV.

The King's Scout is the title of a small volume of addresses to children by the Rev. H. G. Tunnicliff, B.A. (Allenson; 1s. net). Each address is on some minor Old Testament personality. This is the address on

VASHTI.

In the far distant East, there once lived a mighty King. So powerful and all conquering was he, that his possessions stretched from India to Africa, and he even tried to conquer Greece.

In the third year of his reign, he decided to give a great feast to his subjects, and to let men see something of his riches and his generosity. To his palace he summoned all the citizens of the royal city, even the very poorest and humblest were invited, and for seven days they ate and drank as much as they pleased.

How delighted the citizens were at this magnificent treat! Everything around them awakened their wonder. The Court in which they gathered was hung with fine white and blue cloth, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to rings of silver and great pillars of marble. The pavement was of white marble and alabaster, and stone of blue colour, and upon it all around were couches of pure gold and silver. When the guests were thirsty, they were given beautiful cups of gold from which to drink, each cup being of a different shape from any other.

Every one had a time of great enjoyment, and the praises of the great and generous King were sung by all.

But there was one great mistake that had been made in the arrangement of the feast. Wine was provided, and each could drink as much as he pleased. You can easily imagine what happened. All too soon men became intoxicated, and, worst of all, the great King himself failed to set a good example to his subjects. He who was such a brave general and strong ruler could not rule himself. On the very last day of the revels he took too much wine, and lost his senses. Whilst this feasting had been going on in the Court, the beautiful Queen had been giving entertainment to the women of the palace, and had not come out to join the others. In his drunken state, the King suddenly thought of her, and, as he was very proud of her, he decided to send for her, so that all his princes and his people might see how stately and beautiful she looked in her royal robes and dazzling crown.

The Queen, however, had heard of all that was going on. She knew that many of the men were intoxicated, and she learned that the King was as bad as his people. Angry at his so forgetting the dignity of a monarch, and determined in her resolution to keep away from such a scene of drunkenness, she sent back the haughty answer that she would not obey the King. She well knew that her reply might cost her her life, for in those days kings were all-powerful, but she so hated the evils of intemperance, that she was ready to die rather than have anything to do with the drunken ruler.

When her message reached the King he boiled with rage. Never before had any one dared to disobey him. The men around him trembled at his anger, not knowing upon whom his wrath might fall.

'How shall we punish her?' demanded the King.

Anxious to please and pacify him, one of his courtiers suggested that the King should send out a proclamation that the disobedient Queen should lose her position and be driven out of the royal palace. Had the King been sober, he might have realized the reasonableness of his Queen's refusal, and not have been so ready to punish her. In his half-dazed state, however, he thundered out that it was the very best advice that he could have received, and he sent a messenger at once to that part of the palace where the Queen lived, that her crown and her robes were to be taken from her, for she was no longer his Queen. Dressed in simple clothes, on foot, and without any attendants, she, who had enjoyed all the splendours of the Court, slipped quietly away from the palace, poor so far as outward circumstances went, but rich, because she had done her duty, and still retained the greatest of all possessions—the testimony of a good conscience.

Remember the two lessons of this story. The awful evil of intemperance, and the supreme value of 'a conscience void of offence toward God and men.'

The drunken King was Ahasuerus (in your ancient history you will come across him under his familiar name of Xerxes), and the fearless Queen, whose character is so worthy of our imitation, was named Vashti. You will find the story in the first chapter of the Book of Esther.

Jesus upon 'Stumbling-blocks.'

By the Rev. James Moffatt, D.D., D.Litt., Yates Professor of Greek and New Testament Exegesis, Mansfield College, Oxford.

Two things, Jesus taught, were impossible: that the sin against the Holy Spirit could be forgiven, and that 'stumbling-blocks' (*σκάνδαλα*) could be avoided altogether in human intercourse. The unpardonable sin has arrested the attention of the Church, sometimes to very little profit. But the exceptional severity of the teaching of Jesus upon *σκάνδαλα* has not always impressed the Christian conscience; it is one of the points at which the ethical emphasis of the gospel has been repeatedly missed. To some extent this has been the result of passing from one language to another. In a recent issue of this magazine (pp. 331–332), Professor Moulton has raised the problem of the etymology of the Greek term, in view of a forthcoming attempt by Archdeacon Allen to establish 'snare' or 'trap' as the proper meaning of *σκάνδαλον*. I shall be interested to see if any fresh arguments can be added to those which Mr. Carr brought forward in his paper (*Expositor*, 5th ser., vol. viii. p. 344 f.). Not long ago I had occasion to look into this problem, and I confess the evidence for this interpretation of *σκάνδαλον* and *σκανδαλίζειν* did not appear cogent, so far as the N.T. was concerned. It is unfortunate that the other sense has no strict or satisfactory equivalent in our language. 'Stumbling-block' is less misleading than 'offence,' but it has no verb, and it hardly conveys to a modern reader what the Greek word carried home to a primitive Christian. Even a rendering like 'hindrance' is too weak. But what I wish to urge in this paper is rather the passion and intensity with which the words of Jesus on this matter are always charged. Whatever the etymology of the Greek term may be, there is no doubt as to the ethical verdict of Jesus upon those who proved *σκάνδαλα* to other people. One of the very sternest sayings in the Gospels flashed from His lips at the thought of this sin, and every word about *σκάνδαλον* and *σκανδαλίζειν* thrills with an acute sense of danger to the soul. I am afraid that the rather conventional associations of the English words 'offend' and 'offence' have been partly responsible for the fact that many readers of the N.T. do not realize the tremendous severity of what Jesus said about 'stumbling-blocks.' It is true, of course, as any student of patristic literature and interpretation knows, that this evaporation began at an early period, even when Greek was the language of the Church. Chrysostom, for example, took *σκάνδαλον* in Mt 18^{7} to mean *ἡ ὕβρις*. 'Do not be surprised,' he added, 'at this, for many *τῶν μικροψύχων* have felt no common dishonour in being overlooked and insulted.' It is hopelessly flat to suppose that when Jesus spoke about a man causing one 'of these little ones to stumble,' He meant nothing but contempt and dishonour; yet we come upon this view more than once, even in an expositor like Theophylact. Still, the antiquity of an error is no excuse for its survival, and the sharp edge of the sayings of Jesus upon 'stumbling-blocks' is missed to-day by many who have never heard of patristic exegesis.

The central passage is in Lk $17^{1.\,2}$:

'To his disciples he said: "It is inevitable (*ἀνένδεκτον*; cf. *οὐκ ἐνδέχεται*, 13^{33}) that hindrances (*σκάνδαλα*) should come, but woe to the man by whom they come; it would be well for him to have a millstone hung round his neck, and be flung into the sea, rather than prove a hindrance to one of these little ones."' The equivalents of both sayings occur in Mt $18^{6.\,7}$, though in the reverse order: Mark (9^{42}) only records the second saying that a man were better dead than be a pitfall for the faith of others.

Jesus here as elsewhere (Mt 13^{41}) frankly contemplates the existence of people in His community who may become *σκάνδαλα* to their fellow-members, *i.e.* the means of causing their fall. To be a 'hindrance,' in this sense, is to bring about the moral fall of another. We must admit, of course, that it is not the only cause of failure. When cases of backsliding or apostasy occur, they are not always due to the bad influence or un-Christian conduct of another person; Jesus elsewhere allows for inward weakness of mind or will, yielding to the pressure of hardship or circumstances. Men and women do fall away from their faith, but it is not invariably a direct result of what some one else in their society has done or said. In fact, we may

say that Jesus spoke about 'being hindered or tripped up' (*σκανδαλίζεσθαι*) from two points of view. It was a sin, He taught, to find any hindrance in Himself or in His gospel, to be taken aback and disconcerted by the hardships involved in His service, for example,[1] or by the new departures which He made in religion.[2] He knew that there was a temptation to be disappointed with what He said and did,[3] and that when people saw Him running counter to their prejudices or ignoring some cherished ambition or tradition of their circle, they might be tempted to object, to doubt Him, to cool in their loyalty,[4] if not to drop out of the ranks of His followers altogether. Paul afterwards spoke of the *σκάνδαλον* which the cross proved to Jews, but Jesus knew in His own lifetime that He was a *σκάνδαλον* to some of His contemporaries, owing to the very loyalty of His life to the will of God. It upset some people, among His adherents, to discover that He took a Messianic line so different from what as patriots and pious Jews they expected. In this sense Jesus was a *σκάνδαλον* to them; He repelled them, and they resented Him; but the fault was theirs not His. On the other hand, He taught that it was a heinous, deadly sin[5] to prove a *σκάνδαλον* to others by one's bad conduct. 'Whoever is a hindrance to one of these little ones who believe in me, better for him to have a great millstone hung round his neck, and be sunk in the deep sea. Woe to the world for hindrances! Hindrances have to come (*ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα*), but—woe to the man by whom the hindrance does come!' These are terrible words on what Jesus regarded as the terrible sin of endangering the faith of others, and it is always relevant to analyze what He meant by this particular sin.[6]

[1] So *σκανδαλίζονται* in Mk 4^{17} = Mt 13^{21}, for which Luke substitutes *ἀφίστανται*.

[2] So Mt 11^{6} = Lk 7^{23}, the beatitude: *μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί*.

[3] So Mt 13^{57} = Mk 6^{3} (his fellow-countrymen), Mt 26^{31} = Mk 14^{27} (the disciples), and Mt 15^{12} (the Pharisees). Chrysostom points out, from Mt 15^{12} and 17^{27}, how Jesus 'taught us when to consider those who are offended' (*σκανδαλιζομένων*).

[4] This is the thought of Jn 6^{61} (*τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει*).

[5] 'Même la mort la plus ignominieuse et la plus cruelle serait préférable au sort éternel qui l'attend après le scandale donné' (Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, ii. pp. 77–78).

[6] A pointed comment on the subject, from the standpoint of the 'little ones,' is given by Augustine's letter to Felicia (*Ep.* ccviii).

The context in Mark throws little light on the meaning. Mk 9^{42-48} is a paragraph on the danger of *σκάνδαλα*, both those which arise from human intercourse (v.[42]) and those which are due to the passions of one's own nature (vv.[43-48]); but the saying on the former does not connect naturally with the preceding sayings and incidents.[7] The context in Luke may indicate that one of the main features of this sin was the unforgiving spirit in the community, for the saying is at once followed by a demand for mutual forgiveness (Lk $17^{3.4}$). Here again it is what follows that serves to elucidate the meaning. But in Matthew's record the context is more explicit. Jesus has just (17^{24-27}) agreed to pay the temple-tax, in order to avoid giving needless offence (*ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίζωμεν αὐτούς*). He refuses to leave a wrong impression on the mind of the authorities, or to create a prejudice gratuitously against Himself and His adherents. Then follows the rebuke to the ambitious disciples, leading up to the saying about the danger of outraging and upsetting the faith of weaker disciples. That is, Matthew suggests, by this juxtaposition of sayings on *σκάνδαλα*, an argument from less to more; if you ought to avoid outraging public opinion, how much more careful should you be to eschew anything that would deflect and injure the religious character of your fellows in the society? Consideration for the interests of the latter is a paramount duty. He then reproduces the Marcan sayings about the members of one's own body[8] as sources of 'hindrance,' and finally echoes the sayings reproduced in Luke about the duty of brotherly forgiveness, though he does not suggest that the uncharitable, implacable temper was a 'hindrance,' as Luke probably[9] does.

It is in the light of such references to this sin that we can understand what Jesus had in mind. He was speaking from experience, when He said these heavy words about the people who led or tried to lead others astray. Not long before, He

[7] The nearest is in v.[37].

[8] It is possible that Matthew meant members of the community by 'hand' and 'foot' in this connexion (cf. 1 Co 12^{14-21}); this would tally with the following paragraph (cf. v.[17]). The interpretation goes back to Origen, and is developed by Theophylact and Isho'dad of Merv.

[9] Cyril of Alexandria (*Comm. on Luke*, tr. from Syriac by R. Payne Smith, vol. ii. p. 533 f.) takes it so. 'And what,' he said, 'are the offences? Mean and annoying actions, I suppose; fits of anger, insults, slanders very frequently.'

had turned sharply on Peter with the rebuke, 'Get behind me, you Satan. You are a hindrance to me' (Mt 16^{23}). The subtlest temptations may come to us from those who mean well to us, from our very friends who act or speak in all good intention. Peter thought Jesus was throwing His life away, in taking the path that led to suffering and the cross. He thought so, and said so. Jesus was strong enough to brush this hindrance out of His way, but He knew that many weaker disciples would be tempted to yield to the same insidious suggestion. His intense care for them[1] was part and parcel of His teaching on the power and responsibility of influence. 'Let your light shine before men.' 'You are the light of the world.' If you do right, you help others to do right; also, if you do wrong, you drag others down. But He does not imply that this misleading influence is always deliberate. Our personal character and conduct, no doubt, move others either towards or away from God, but Jesus implies that to prove a *σκάνδαλον* to others need not be a conscious attempt to upset their faith. Sometimes (we may probably say much more often) it is involuntary; the man does not realize what are the consequences of his action. None the less, Jesus warns the disciples, a man is responsible for them. He speaks on behalf of the 'little ones,' because it is they who trust instinctively the example and counsels of older Christians, and who are most easily led astray by careless conduct or thoughtless utterances which are taken to sanction a wrong course.[2] To refuse forgiveness, to suggest by one's example that the demand of discipleship is not so hard as might be supposed, or to teach that confession and hardship may be avoided with impunity —that is, for Jesus, a sin which He visits with the utmost reprobation. We say it is diabolic for any man to corrupt wilfully the innocence of a younger person. Jesus said (cf. Mt 13^{41} 16^{23}) it was diabolic to deflect another's faith, even without any deliberate intention of doing harm; a man were better out of the world altogether than do anything which would lead another Christian to be less loyal to God or to lapse from the faith. Hindrances of this kind are unavoidable, He admitted. Even in a society organized for the highest ends, one member can interfere with another. Our lives cross one another repeatedly, and no association of men, even for the advancement of the interests of God's kingdom, can exclude the obstacles and pitfalls which arise out of ambition, self-seeking, censoriousness, softness, the natural tendency to shrink from hardness and discipline, undue laxity or undue severity, especially on the part of those who have some authority and influence. We are accustomed to lay grateful stress upon the value which Jesus attached to personal influence as the supreme method of advancing the kingdom of God in this world. But His teaching at this point has a reverse side, and for that we must look to the various groups of sayings about 'hindrances' and 'hindering.' It is a warning to all who teach Christianity,[3] a warning not to add or omit, from any motive whatsoever, truths which are vital to the gospel. They will be held responsible for having induced others to take Christ less seriously than He meant. It is also a warning to others, not to convey an erroneous impression of the gospel by their words or actions, when their example or precept may prove the undoing of simpler souls in their own circle.[4] 'Woe to the world for hindrances!' We have no right to take 'the world' here, with Origen, as the pagan society with which Christians have no connexion. Jesus means the world, 'the very world, which is the world of all of us,' where His followers have to live together, and experience not only the help but the temptations of human intercourse. 'But,' He adds, 'woe to the man by whom the hindrance comes,' that makes another fall away.[5] It is morally certain that such pitfalls will be met with, in the course of life; yet that does not, in the judgment of Jesus, absolve the individual whose misconduct proves an obstacle to his neighbours. He may bring disaster on them, but he brings a worse disaster on himself.

[1] It is reflected in Paul's passionate word of 2 Co 11^{29} (*τὶς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι*).

[2] *Σκάνδαλα δὲ νοεῖ τοὺς ἐμποδίζοντας πρὸς τὰ καλά* (Theophylact).

[3] Cf. Ro 16^{17}. Origen's definition of *σκάνδαλον* (*Cels.* v. 64) is: *ὅπερ εἰώθαμεν λέγειν περὶ τῶν διαστρεφόντων ἀπὸ τῆς ὑγιοῦς διδασκαλίας τοὺς ἁπλουστέρους καὶ εὐεξαπατήτους.*

[4] Cf. Paul's attitude in Ro $14^{1.\ 15}$, 1 Co 8^{9-13}.

[5] In Mt 24^{10}, where Dn 11^{41} (*σκανδαλισθήσονται*) is quoted —though there is no allusion to temptation in the O.T. passage—ruin or final apostasy is meant, and this sense is never far from most of the references of Jesus. But the term did not necessarily involve an irretrievable relapse, as we can see from Paul and Hermas (*Vis.* iv. 1. 3: 'I ask the Lord . . . to grant repentance to his servants' (*τοῖς ἐσκανδαλισμένοις*).

Literature.

THE GOLDEN BOUGH.

The third edition of Sir J. G. Frazer's great work in Magic and Religion called *The Golden Bough* is now complete in twelve volumes. The twelfth volume contains a Bibliography and General Index (Macmillan; 20s. net).

The General Index incorporates the separate indexes to the volume. And it does more. In the later volumes the separate Indexes were much fuller than in the earlier. The author has enlarged the indexes to the earlier volumes, bringing them into line with the rest. It is no longer necessary to search several volumes to find a reference, as we have repeatedly had to do. More than that, it will no longer be our experience to find that the reference is not in the index to *any* of the volumes.

It is such an Index as will give pleasure to consult. Why is the science of indexing still in its infancy? Not one book in a thousand is indexed scientifically, that is, practically. Take an example. Mr. Arnold Toynbee's *Nationality and the War* has an index. This is how Italy is given:

> Italy, kingdom of, 100, 102, 243, 245, v., 406, 427, 429, 446, 478, 492, 506.
> Italy, Union of (Risorgimento), 8–9, 98, 100, 103, 108, 173–4, 211–2, 249, 287.

That is not an extreme example, by any means. The distinction between 'Italy, kingdom of' and 'Italy, Union of' is an advance on the ordinary index. But suppose that we have read this book and remember that somewhere in it the statement is made that the lack of harmony between Greece and Albania is due to Italy. If we turn to Albania in the Index we are faced with fourteen references to pages; if to Greece we are confronted with sixteen. We try Italy at last and resolve to turn to page after page until we find it. That is the unscientific index. This is how Italy is done in Sir J. G. Frazer's General Index:

> Italy, change in the flora of, i. 8; 'Sawing the Old Woman' at Mid-Lent in, iv. 240 *sq.*; seven-legged effigies of Lent in, iv. 244 *sq.*; swinging as a festal rite in modern, iv. 283, 284; hot springs in, v. 213; divination at Mid-summer in, v. 254; 'killing the Hare' at harvest in, vii. 280; cure of warts in, ix. 48; birth-trees in, xi. 165; mistletoe in, xi. 316, 317.
> Italy, ancient, spinning on highroads forbidden to women in, i. 113, viii. 119 *n.*[5]; forests of, ii. 8; tree-worship in, ii. 10; sacred groves in, ii. 122; oaks sacred to Jupiter in, ii. 361; vintage inaugurated by priests in, viii. 133; colleges of the Salii in, ix. 232; the Ambarvalia in, ix. 359.

Sir J. G. Frazer has prepared the General Index himself. The Bibliography has been prepared by the Press Reader. He has gathered all the references in literature in the footnotes into an alphabetical order and the thing is done. And yet, to our thinking, the Bibliography will be of even greater value than the Index.

WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

The sixth volume has been issued of *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.*, as edited by Mr. Nehemiah Curnock and others (Kelly). The illustrations and notes are as satisfactory as before, leaving nothing undone or requiring improvement, so far as can at present be perceived. And it is not at all likely that future editors will find much to reward the most diligent research, so thorough has been the labour of love which the editor and his assistants have accomplished. There is little doubt that for many a day, if not for all the days, this will be the standard edition. The Notes are written with a distinct sense of style—a good thing for them, else had they suffered severely by comparison with the text. There are four special Notes, one of which, as example for all, we shall quote:

'The American War, even before the outbreak of hostilities, was the background of the present sections of Wesley's Journal. Both in England and New England politicians were beating ploughshares into swords. The Church, too feeble or too deeply compromised to interpose, gazed with unseeing eyes on the moral problems involved. Meanwhile, two men of providence wrestled with the situation. John Wesley saved England;

Francis Asbury, in the same sense and by exactly similar means, saved America. Asbury, in labours, suffering, spiritual force, intensity and persistency of purpose, and absolute selflessness, rivalled, if he did not outrival, Wesley. Through mother, master, and early friends; through the evangelical clergy heard in the old parish church of West Bromwich and Methodist preachers heard in the great hollow near Wednesbury, he became a faithful replica of Wesley. His novitiate began under Alexander Mather. His school of athletic fitness for a prodigious physical task was his Methodist master's forge. His theological college was his mother's class-meeting, in which also he learned and practised the mystery of extempore prayer and exposition. His brotherly oversight of his master's son taught him the true pastor's art, and won for him a life-long friendship. Another companion of early youth, Richard Whatcoat, saintly and faithful, became coadjutor-bishop of his old age.

'In four English appointments (1766 to 1770) Asbury learned the "Methodist plan"—itinerancy, early morning, lay, and field preaching, society meetings, Quarterly Meeting finance, Conference rule and discipline—the value of time, method, health, books, music, and the incessant breaking of new ground. Inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost, he attended the Bristol Conference of 1771, and was accepted as a volunteer. His circuit was America. He went saturated with Wesley's thoughts, resolutely set on carrying out the "Methodist plan." Within a fortnight after his arrival in New York he was facing colleagues who urged him to settle in the occupied cities. But he had heard the call of the wilderness and of the Lord of the wilderness. "Calm and dauntless, he declared himself fixed to the Methodist plan." For nearly fifty years he was the outrider of an ever-growing army of apostolic men who knew neither self nor fear, who conquered a continent and covered it with a network of circuits and conferences.'

LUTHER.

Has any man ever in all the history of the world had to pass through such a fire of criticism as Luther? In his lifetime it was as hot as most men have had to meet. But it has lasted, and to-day there is as much ferocity in it as ever. Some amazing books have been published, making charges which had to be repudiated at once by all decent not to say scientific historians. But to see how keen the fire is still one has only to turn to the fourth volume of Professor Hartmann Grisar's *Luther* (Kegan Paul; 12s. net). Grisar, as we have said already more than once, is a painstaking scholar and writes with a desire to be fair and accurate. Yet even he cannot avoid a complete misrepresentation of Luther's mind and conduct in the chapter which he sensationally calls 'Luther and Lying.'

One of the subdivisions of the chapter is entitled 'The New Theology of Lying.' In that subdivision Professor Grisar finds 'Luther's disregard for the laws of truth' in 'the theory he set up of the permissibility of lies.' This 'theory,' he says, was due to his studies in the Old Testament. 'It seems to him that in certain Old Testament instances of such lies those who employed them were not to blame. Abraham's lie in denying that Sarah was his wife, the lie of the Egyptian midwives about the Jewish children, Michal's lie told to save David, appear to Luther justifiable, useful, and wholesome. On Oct. 2, 1524, in his Sermons on Exodus, as it would seem for the first time, he defended his new theory. Lies were only real lies "when told for the purpose of injuring our neighbour"; but, "if I tell a lie, not in order to injure anyone but for his profit and advantage and in order to promote his best interests, this is a lie of service"; such was the lie told by the Egyptian midwives and by Abraham; such lies fall "under the grace of Heaven, *i.e.* came under the forgiveness of sins"; such falsehoods "are not really lies."'

Now it is wonderful to find a member of the Society of Jesus denouncing the theory that in certain cases the end justifies the means, but so it is. The blunder, for it is a blunder on the part of Professor Grisar and no malicious intention, is due to forgetfulness of the difference between Luther's day and ours. To the followers of Luther lying is an abominable thing. To Luther it was abominable also; but he could not see, as we do, that the Old Testament is a history of progress in morality, and it was easier for him, owing to his Catholic environment, to 'explain the lies' of Abraham or of Sarah.

It is thirty years since Mr. George Lorimer gave to the world the result of his research among the

records of St. Cuthbert's Church in Edinburgh. The book has long been out of print. Now therefore a new book has been written and published, which incorporates the old. In thirty years Mr. Lorimer has made many discoveries, and the new book is a handsome quarto. It is published by Messrs. Blackwood under the title of *The Early Days of St. Cuthbert's Church, Edinburgh* (7s. 6d. net).

Perhaps the most interesting, certainly the most amazing, part of the book is the chapter entitled 'Discipline.' Mr. Lorimer sets down things which he himself wonders at, and thanks God that he lives in a better time. For we have made this discovery—and it is a very great and blessed one—that punishment and public shame harden the heart and lead to greater evil, and do not bring true repentance or amendment of life. How is it, with our Saviour's 'Neither do I condemn thee' so conspicuously in our sight, how is it that it has taken us so long to learn that?

Students of the Petrine literature must not miss *Studies in the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, by E. Iliff Robson, B.D. (Cambridge University Press; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Robson has read all the literature to date and the Epistle itself. He concludes thus: (1) there are four passages of a Petrine character, a Preaching (1^{5-11}), a Gospel (1^{16-18}), a Prophecy (1^{20}–2^{19}), and an Apocalypse (3^{3-13}); (2) these four passages are fitted together (as cement fits and fixes the stones in a porch) by an editor, who prefixes, quite honestly, a formal salutation in the name of Peter; introduces the subject of Prophecy with a skilful sentence looking both backward and forward; and closes it with a natural, if not very literary, comment. After giving his reasons for preferring Apostolic citations to his own efforts (iii. 1, 2), he quotes a passage certainly not his own, for the opening words are from the 'Prophetic Word,' also cited by Clement of Rome. At the conclusion of this passage, he writes an Epilogue which most skilfully sums up all that has gone before: 'Be zealous in virtuous living; do not be led astray on the subject of the Parousia, but grow in grace and knowledge.'

The literature of Missions is at last coming to be recognized as part of the literature of the world. The missionary has discovered that it is not enough to be earnest; he must also be interesting. A great advance in the direction of popular appeal is made by a volume on *The Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam* (Humphrey Milford; 3s. 6d. net). It contains six studies by six separate authors—(1) 'Vital Elements in Islam,' by the Rev. W. H. T. Gairdner, Cairo; (2) 'Specific Points in Islam with which Moslems are dissatisfied,' by the Rev. W. A. Shedd, D.D., Urumia; (3) 'Elements in the Christian Gospel and Christian Life which appeal to Moslems,' by Pastor Gottfried Simon, Sumatra; (4) 'Elements in the Christian Gospel and Christian Life which awaken Opposition and create Difficulty among Moslems,' by Professor Stewart Crawford, Beirut; (5) 'Points of Contact between Christianity and Islam,' by Professor Sirāju'd Dīn, Lahore; and (6) 'Light shed on the Vital Elements of Christianity and on the New Testament by contact with Islam,' by Canon Godfrey Dale, Zanzibar. An introduction is contributed by Dr. S. M. Zwemer, and a closing Essay by Professor D. B. Macdonald.

To their long list of large and marvellously cheap books Messrs. Jack have added *A Guide to the English Language* (5s. net). It is a very thick quarto, double column, and is divided into four parts. The first part treats of Composition, the second of Vocabulary, the third of Style, and the fourth of many minor matters. The work is all original, every chapter having its own author; and Mr. H. C. O'Neill being the editor is guarantee for the accuracy of the whole work. It is not merely for authors that the book has been prepared; the letter-writer will find it useful. And those who rarely write even a letter may also consult it profitably, for it will enable them to speak more correctly than they do. No doubt teachers will discover its worth for their work. But they must not rejoice over the discovery, for it is able to make the teacher a superfluity.

The life of Jacob offers excellent material for a popular study of psychology, and the Rev. Henry Howard is the very man to make a good use of it. In ten chapters he exhibits Jacob passing from place to place and from state to state, the state not being without influence on the place any more than the place on the state, till we see him at last in the court of the Pharaoh, with his polite but penetrating record, 'Few and evil have been the days of the years of my life.' But he was a Prince with

God who made that humble confession. And so the title of the book is *A Prince in the Making* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net).

The Apocalypse of St. John is issued in 'The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures' (Longmans; 1s. net). The Introduction is up to date and useful. The notes are, as before, reduced to the barest necessity. The text is in fine large type. It is a real pleasure to know that Roman Catholics will be encouraged so happily to read the Bible for themselves.

The Rev. Paul B. Bull, M.A., Priest of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield, has written a book on *The Sacramental Principle* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). By the Sacramental Principle he means the truth 'that spirit expresses itself in matter, and that the material universe is a burning bush, aflame with the will and purpose of God.' The universe may be explained in three ways. One way is that there is nothing in it but matter. All is material fact and force. This is materialistic monism. Another way is that there is nothing but mind or spirit. All is due to our thinking. This is spiritualistic monism. Mr. Bull believes that both methods of explaining the universe are wrong. The right way is to accept both matter and spirit as realities and believe that matter is always being moulded by spirit. This is the Sacramental Principle.

Now in Mr. Bull's experience the Sacramental Principle is best seen in the Holy Communion. And it is to commend to Puritans and Protestants generally this view of the eucharist that the book is written. It is Mr. Bull's 'apologia pro vita sua,' his answer to the question why he is a Priest of the Community of the Resurrection.

A series of Good Friday addresses on *The Cross and Passion* delivered by the Rev. George Hodges, Dean of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Mass., has been published by Messrs. Macmillan (4s. 6d. net). The addresses are on the Seven Words. It is a strange providence that has made these seven sentences the subject of so much exposition. The same things are said over and over again. But the Words are not exhausted. And there comes an expositor now and then—like Bishop Bernard last month or Dean Hodges this month—who looks at them for himself and interprets them afresh out of his own understanding and experience.

Dean Hodges has also written a volume on *The Episcopal Church, its Faith and Order* (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). It handles ten topics in ten chapters. Each topic and each chapter is complete by itself, and no desire seems to have been felt to connect it with its neighbours. The topics are: The Bible, the Prayer Book, Baptism, Confirmation, Renunciation, Obedience, the Creed, the Church, Prayer, the Holy Communion. The writing is pleasantly simple and clear. It is a book of instruction for young people, to whom its freedom from the rigidity of system will be half its recommendation.

The Rev. Cyril Hepher went out to New Zealand 'to preach a Mission' at Havelock, which is a small town in the North Island. The Vicar of Havelock, by name Alan Gardiner, found a few Quakers in his parish and offered them his vestry as a meeting-house. He even joined them, he and his family. And others followed the example. When Mr. Hepher arrived, the meetings had been held for some time in the church. It was with misgiving that he, a High Churchman, joined in the silent prayer which was the form of worship. But the blessing he received proved the wisdom of the movement. And now he has written the whole story and advocated earnestly the use of silent prayer in worship, publishing it all in a book called *The Fellowship of Silence* (Macmillan).

Mr. Hepher has not written the whole book himself. There is a chapter in it by the late Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, and there are two chapters by his daughter, Miss L. V. Hodgkin. These are the Quaker chapters. There are chapters also by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, and the Rev. J. C. Fitzgerald. And from first to last the object is to encourage the Church to make silent prayer a part of her worship and to enjoy the fellowship that it gives. So it is a book with a purpose; but it is as delightful to read as if it were a work of art pure and simple.

Henry Osborn Taylor, Litt.D., sees men everywhere in search of salvation. But what is salvation? It is freedom of the spirit. It is deliverance from the bondage of corruption. It is entrance into the glorious liberty of the sons of

God. It is fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.

The greater the personality the more earnest the search. Dr. Osborn Taylor begins with the Chaldæans and Egyptians, passes to China, thence to India and to Persia, and reaches the land of Israel. He keeps to the chronological, not the geographical order. So after the Prophets of Israel come the Poets and the Philosophers of Greece, whence, through certain Intermediaries, he brings us to Jesus. From Jesus he carries us to Paul and to Augustine, and bids us look into the future. The title of the last chapter is 'The Arrows are beyond thee.'

We said that *Deliverance*—that is the title of the book (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net)—is communion with the Father through the Son. We see that when we come to Jesus. Dr. Taylor does not say that the Chaldæans or any other of the ancient nations found deliverance consciously, as did the Hebrew prophets, in a coming Messiah. But when we see that to him Jesus is no less than the Son of God, we understand that he finds the words, 'No one cometh unto the Father but by me,' applicable to all men, and the true source of their salvation. For, as John says, He was always coming into the world, though the world as a whole knew Him not.

It is a valuable book, and it is written by one whose appreciation of the English language is revealed in the trouble he takes with it.

Mr. Yone Noguchi, who wrote a little book on *The Spirit of Japanese Poetry* for Mr. Murray's 'Wisdom of the East' series, has now written for the same series a similar book on *The Spirit of Japanese Art* (2s. net). It is not Japan that is a wonder to the West, it is every single Japanese man. Mr. Noguchi knows the art of his native land as well as its literature, and he can write in English with the grammatical accuracy and idiomatic supremacy of a born Briton.

The Rev. R. L. Bellamy, B.D., LL.D., Rector of Kirkby Overblow, has published six Lenten addresses on the government of the tongue. *The Unruly Member* is the title (Nisbet; 1s. 6d. net). The topics are Truthfulness, Slander, Candour, Hastiness, Profanity, Silence. Dr. Bellamy is as alive to the sins of the tongue as was the Lord's brother. Especially is he alive to the sin of profanity. Referring to the reverence felt by Jews for the sacred Name, he says: 'A good Jew will always try to avoid treading upon a scrap of paper, for fear that that Name might be written on it. Another curious evidence of this reverence is to be found in the Jews' system of numerals. They employ the letters of their alphabet for this purpose, as, roughly speaking, we might consider A to equal 1, B to equal 2, and so on. But when they come to the number 15, instead of combining the letters which stand for 10 and 5, they depart from the ordinary rule and use those which stand for 9 and 6 (טו). And the sole reason for this is because the two letters which stand for 10 and 5 (יה) are the same two with which the sacred Name "Jehovah" (יהוה) begins.'

With all its practical purpose *Factors in Conduct*, by Dr. Thiselton Mark (Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), is a contribution to theoretical ethics of very great value. Still, it is practice and not theory that Dr. Mark is concerned with. His objective is conduct not conversation. It is conversation in the old sense of that word, the whole attitude and action of the daily life. It is the Apostle's 'Let your conversation be such as becometh the Gospel of Christ.'

First of all he sets us in our right relation to the Universe. Next he discusses the connexion between Conduct and Morality. Then he shows that Morality is such Conduct as tends to Harmony between the Self and Reality. Finally he explains the influence that Conduct and Personality have on one another. Get young men and women to read this excellent and exhilarating book before the evil days come.

Religion and Moral Civilisation is the title of the Prolegomena to an Historical Enquiry into the Influence of Religion upon Moral Civilisation (Watts; 2s. 6d. net). The author, Mr. Frank Hill Perrycoste, B.Sc., says: 'The object of this Essay is to enquire into the actual historical influence of religion upon morality, not from the standpoint of one who eagerly seizes upon all evidence unfavourable to a hostile system and suppresses or mis-states all such facts as make in favour of that system, but from the standpoint of an opponent of religion, certainly, and one who has gradually learnt to consider that, on the whole and in net result, religion has been a curse to mankind

—yet an honest and candid opponent, who intends to cite every available piece of evidence, whether favourable or adverse to religion, that he has been able to collect from the materials which he has studied.'

He is anxious to be considered fair while 'frankly announcing his anti-religious convictions.' But it is amusing to find him confessing that he has 'split a record or a quotation into two or more parts, and assigned these to different and perhaps widely separated chapters.' 'If by chance,' he then says, 'any reader, turning up a reference, should find that something derogatory is quoted but some qualifying praise omitted, he may rest quite assured that, were the complete work before him, he would find the balance of praise duly credited to the proper account in the appropriate chapter.' Now the complete work is not likely to be 'before' the reader for some time. It is to consist of forty-eight chapters, of which the present volume contains only four chapters, and other four have been published previously.

What is the object? It is to prove that the best education is a purely secular one.

The Beatitudes.

By Professor Robert Mackintosh, M.A., D.D., Lancashire College, Manchester.

We have had handed down to us, in two different forms, a group of sayings spoken by Jesus at the outset—both traditions agree in this—of His greatest connected discourse regarding the Kingdom of God. The sayings may number seven, or eight, or nine. According to the version in Matthew, there are nine apparently—all of them beatitudes. According to the version in Luke, there are four beatitudes flanked by four woes or curses. On the whole, with reservations to be noted below, one concludes that Matthew's report is much the more credible. Our brief investigation takes no account of the problems of higher criticism, but its results may easily be harmonized with the usually accepted solutions of the Synoptic problem. So far as we are concerned, it is equally thinkable that Luke modified the tradition, or that it came into his hands already recast.

Let us begin with the common nucleus of four beatitudes. In calling it a nucleus, one does not mean to affirm that the nucleus was ever separately published. To the present writer, that seems in a high degree improbable. It may have been a nucleus in the mind of Jesus, round which other kindred material gathered. But it will be safest to understand 'nucleus' as merely a piece of classification or generalization. We shall employ the term, as lawyers say, 'without prejudice.'

(*a*) The nucleus does, however, reveal a common character, as contrasted even with Matthew's remaining beatitudes. The four sayings which are jointly attested might be termed the 'paradoxes' of the Kingdom of God. To be poor, to be sad, to be hungry—*i.e.* full of longings—to be persecuted, is to be *happy*. Of course each paradox is fully half resolved by the time Jesus has completed the sentence in which He formulates it; He is no epigrammatist, talking for effect. But it was His manner, to startle His audience into thinking. He catches their ears at the outset with one, two, three sayings which begin as a challenge to the stolid common sense of worldly minds.

(*b*) It follows that Matthew's expansions are more likely to be interpretative glosses than a literal historical report of what Jesus said. The position is not quite clear; one might quote O.T. parallels, like Is 57^{15} or 66^{2}, which include as much interpretative matter as we find in Matthew's version of the Beatitudes. Yet one judges it likelier upon the whole that Jesus did not Himself blunt the startling quality of His opening half sentences. On the other hand, Matthew (backed as we have noted by the O.T.) seems altogether right *ad sensum*. The 'poverty' which Jesus—or which the O.T.—commends is not mere impecuniosity. Since wealth is a temptation and virtuous industry a safeguard, the word 'poor'—and kindred terms—had come in the later days of the O.T. to connote godliness.

(*c*) There is a direct O.T. origin for the second beatitude; it comes—almost *verbatim*, after the Greek Bible—from Is 61^{2}. When we compare

Luke's synagogue sermon at Nazareth, we see how closely the two Gospels—our first and our third—agree in the keynote which they sound at the outset of their record of Jesus' teaching. Matthew as well as Luke makes Christ begin with 'glad tidings to the poor,' and with a promise of consolation to the mourners. For the promise to the hungry, we should rather compare Ps $107^{5.9}$. The promise to the persecuted does not admit of O.T. parallels. Partly, and obviously, the hope of 'reward in heaven' was too late in its origin to create within ancient Israel any Christian tone of triumphant joy. But, more deeply too, the whole 'worship of sorrow'—if one may borrow a striking though not altogether accurate phrase—is Christ's creation. His people are happy not merely in spite of, but because of their sufferings and persecutions. Let us just note that the blessing pronounced upon the mourner remains unglossed. If any gloss were introduced, we should have to explain the sorrowfulness which Christ praises as sorrow for sin—the pangs of a conscience-stricken mind. Some of the O.T. verses already referred to might support that interpretation. Yet on the whole we may be glad that not these verses but rather the pattern of Is 61^{2} has prevailed, and that other sadnesses besides the sacred sorrow of penitence are included in the welcome uttered by Jesus.

(*d*) The nucleus as we find it in Luke has no softening explanations. Everything is clear-cut and sharply defined. Hence some not unnaturally hold that the Lucan tradition of the sayings is the more original, Wendt, *e.g.*, recognizing in it Jesus' desire to speak 'with the greatest emphasis and brevity.' Not because that is an unfair report of Jesus' manner, but because of peculiarities in the present passage yet to be noted, one is strongly disinclined to think that the social-revolutionary version gives us the real or even the literal teaching of the Master. Yet the social-revolutionary reading of Christ's words is attested not merely in the Third Gospel, but in the Epistle of James. And, absurd as is the view that primitive Christianity was a proletarian striving—who can say how much of this element may have co-operated with higher influences? Nay, who can show—or could wish to show—that these enthusiastic or even wild hopes had not their part to play in the redemption of the world?

(*e*) A question of no great importance still remains. Is 'Matthew' right, who puts the sayings in the third person, or Luke, who transfers them to the second? Matthew, I believe. If I may trust my sense of Greek idiom—but this I do not do unreservedly—the Greek lends itself better to Matthew's formulation; the difference being of course confined to a single Greek word in each verse—'yours,' 'theirs.' True, of course, that Matthew's closing saying itself gives us 'Blessed are *ye*.' But this argument is double-edged. The closing saying in Matthew is no longer than any of the others; where it stands as number 4 in Luke, it again appears of unusual length—quite out of proportion even to the length of the fourth Woe, which Luke balances over against it! A saying of exceptional type, more fitted to stand at the end than in the middle—surely it is the first gospel, not the third, which must be followed here! And so we may accept the first Gospel's 'Blessed are *they*'—if it were of importance; it hardly is.[1]

II.

What shall we say regarding Luke's enlargement of the nucleus by adding four corresponding Woes, or Curses?

The Pentateuch tells of a hilltop scene, in which blessings (on obedience) were to be spoken from one mountain, and curses (upon disobedience) from another. The text has reached us in curious confusion. In that passage, at any rate, blessings have disappeared, and curses alone remain—a state of matters which a Christian may well be disposed to think characteristic of the economy of law. Shall we not call it equally characteristic if the N.T. shows a converse change? If here it is the curses that disappear—if blessings alone are spoken by Christ on His hilltop? But let us look at the evidence. We have already confessed that Jesus *might* have intensified His emphasis by antithetic enlargements. No human speaker was ever so unguarded as this Master of ours. One might almost say, He had rather be misapprehended than that the truth He spoke should be wholly neglected. He is our great example—but, before we ourselves strive to copy Him in detail, let us be sure we are equal in

[1] Supplementary evidence against Luke's record might be added from the next words he subjoins, 'I say unto you *that hear*.' If these are not an echo from omitted parts of the discourse: 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you'; they are an awkward return from the rhetorical apostrophe of the absent 'rich' to the actual surroundings of the Speaker.

some sense to His methods. It is useless for weaklings to seek to bend Ulysses' bow.

The evidence will be found particularly in the 'reasons annexed' to each blessing or to its corresponding curse—they hang very closely together. The mourners are happy—for they are to laugh; those that laugh are unhappy—for they are to mourn and weep. The hungry are to be full—and the full are to be hungry. Is this an intenser emphasis upon spiritual truth? Or is it—more likely—a degraded version of Jesus' words?[1] The world is well aware that 'he laughs best who laughs last.' We hardly need Holy Writ to confirm us in that persuasion; nor should we expect the school of Christ to find in *that* circumstance the distinctive superiority of godliness over sin. The first blessing of all stands in Luke as good as unchanged. There is something to be learned, however, from the first Woe. The rich 'have *received* their *consolation*.' One word—'have *received*' appears to be an interesting echo of Mt $6^{2.5.16}$; the other—'consolation'—recalls Is 61^{2}, Mt 5^{4}. But is it not misplaced in Luke? The *promise* of consolation is appropriate to those who are now mournful; the *taunt* of 'consolation already' is cruel mockery if addressed to those who have fallen victims to 'the deceitfulness of riches.' Surely the mocker is Luke, or an Ebionite source of Luke's, rather than Jesus Christ. The *last* 'woe' is exceedingly interesting and felicitous, yet not beyond the power of pious Christians who had begun an antithetic amplification of the Beatitudes and knew the O.T. well.

Accordingly, while it is not unthinkable that Jesus should have spoken as Lucan tradition alleges, and while the meaning is much the same on either tradition, the strong probability seems to be that the Woes are unoriginal—an idea borrowed from the denunciations of Mt 23, Lk 11.

III.

Lastly, we have to consider Matthew's additional beatitudes, and their possible O.T. origin.

The blessing on the *meek* seems to be unoriginal in this context. It is a mere literal repetition of Ps 37^{11}—unimproved. It stands between the second and the third of the Paradoxes, interrupting them. It really covers the same ground as the first beatitude. 'Poor' and 'meek' are absolute synonyms. They are merely rival renderings of a single O.T. word. Finally, Jesus has risen above promising inheritance in the 'land.' The Kingdom He pledges is incorruptible and unfading. It is an altogether 'better hope.'

The blessing on the *merciful* is almost equally literal in its dependence on Ps 18^{25}. Almost, but not quite; it exhibits at least something of that characteristic heightening which we generally find when Jesus borrows O.T. sayings. And the thought, we know, was characteristic of our Lord; compare, *e.g.*, Matthew's sequel to the Lord's Prayer (Mt $6^{14.15}$).

The blessing on the *pure* may be described as a marked heightening, as well as reiteration of Ps 24^{4}. What is the requirement for admission to the presence of the King of kings? A pure heart! Such a one shall *see God*.

The blessing on the *peacemakers* seems to be absolutely original. The word appears to have no O.T. parallel; the only N.T. parallel[2] seems to be the verse in Col. which speaks of God's making peace by the blood of Christ's cross. The *promise* in this case comes out of the very heart of Jesus. It meets us again when He speaks in the same chapter to those who love their enemies.

We may infer then, with high probability, that Jesus spoke three paradoxes—blessings on the poor, the sad, the longing; followed them up by three positive moral requirements—pronouncing blessings on the merciful, the pure, the peacemakers; clinched all six in a seventh saying, half paradox, half requirement—'Blessed are the *persecuted* who suffer for *righteousness'* sake.' He can give these no higher promise than He gave to the poor! Those who are heirs to God's Kingdom inherit all things. But—as many an expositor has noted—those persecuted for righteousness' sake have been tested and have stood firm. And so the chain returns upon itself. The first saying and the seventh are linked in one. Lastly, Jesus restates His concluding beatitude with direct reference to His own disciples: 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you.'

Christ's words then pronounce a blessing first on human need, next on humble human goodness.

[1] There is something closely analogous in Lk 17; but one recalls Sharman's judgment, that the greater part of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus may be Judaism untouched by the Christian spirit.

[2] Apart from the echo, Ja 3^{18}.

While the Lucan tradition concentrated on the paradoxical praise of need, we may feel tolerably confident that Jesus' blessings included alike those who needed help and those who were fitted to help others. This supreme Son of God knew no painful friction between religion and morality, between faith and 'works.' Yet no one can suppose that Christ leaves the smallest loophole to self-righteousness! The goodness He praises is that which needs mercy from God and accepts mercy as a supreme boon.

We may also infer from these sayings what is, in Jesus' mind, the central spiritual significance of the Kingdom of God. Comfort—satisfaction—Divine mercy—the unclouded sight of God—to be the true child of such a Father. Blessed, indeed, are they whom the King thus welcomes into God's Kingdom!

Recent Foreign Theology.

Know Thyself.[1]

Students of philosophy, who are unable to read Italian, can now read in their mother tongue some of the works of contemporary Italian thinkers, and can form some estimate of the philosophic activity of Italy. Some of the works of Croce have already been translated, one of the works of Alliotta we noticed lately, and now the work of Varisco has been made accessible to the English reader in the volume before us. The translation of Varisco's *Great Problems* has already been published in the 'Library of Philosophy.' In the same library has also been published Professor Villa's *Contemporary Psychology*. We mention these works in order that the reader may be aware of the philosophical activity of Italy, and of the place she is taking in the great endeavour to understand ourselves and the world in which we live. We have mentioned only a few of the contributions of Italy to contemporary thought which have been rendered into English; but these are only a part of her work, and represent writers whose eminence is great enough to have transcended the Alps. Students of philosophy ought to keep their eye on Italy. Croce, Alliotta, and Varisco have not the same point of view. Nay, they have criticized the works of each other. But the notable thing about them all is that they take up the universal tradition, and labour at the problems of philosophy as these are determined, not by the tradition of any one country, but by the interaction of all the countries that have striven with the great questions of philosophy in all the ages of the past. In the works of these writers we have mentioned, reference is constantly made to authors who have written in English, in French, in German, and even in Russian. That is one of the notable things in contemporary Italian philosophy. It grasps the problem as it has been set to former ages, and to other nations than the Italian.

Professor Varisco deals in this volume with what may be called the fundamental problem of philosophy, and deals with it in a most suggestive way. The reader must, however, bring patience and interest to the study of the volume. There are many things in the argument which give him pause, for the connexion or the inference is not at once apparent. This arises partly from the character of the argument, and partly from the style. While the translation is on due scrutiny intelligible, it is not always couched in the forms which an Englishman is wont to use. The style adds a little to the difficulty of mastering the author's argument. Yet with diligence the book can be understood.

We think that we must begin with a characteristic quotation, which illustrates the style and also the method of reasoning of the author. It is from the introduction, and the paragraph is called 'Consciousness and Subconsciousness.' It is as follows: 'No doubt, to admit this conclusion, indeed to understand it, we must admit that the constitutive consciousness is not equally clear in every subject: over and above the clear or actual consciousness, there is another, and much larger,

[1] 'Library of Philosophy,' edited by J. H. Muirhead, LL.D. *Know Thyself*, by Bernardino Varisco, Professor of Theoretic Philosophy in the University of Rome. Translated by Guglielmo Salvadori, Ph.D., Lecturer in Moral Philosophy in the University of Rome. London: George Allen & Unwin Limited. 10s. 6d. net.

sphere of subconsciousness. And that such a subconsciousness exists, is an undeniable implication of consciousness. I remember: that, which I now remember, would not be that element of my consciousness which in fact it is, if it had not been already an element of my subconsciousness. Our being clearly conscious is in every case the result of a process which implies subconscious elements, and partly takes place in subconsciousness. Moreover, subconsciousness is not a *Deus ex machina* introduced with the object of eliminating difficulties: this would be an elusive contrivance. Consciousness is nothing but subconsciousness organised.' It will be well, however, to state the course of the author's exposition and argument. Almost the whole argument is given in broad outline in the introduction, the doctrine of the phenomenal universe forms the opening paragraph. Then follow sections dealing with reality and cognition—the Subject, Existence of other Subjects, Existence of External Bodies, Mutual Interference of Subjects, Consciousness and Subconsciousness, Unity and Multiplicity, Distinction between Existence and Knowledge, and Distinction between Truth and Error. It will be well that the reader should linger over the introduction, and ponder it somewhat deeply. He will find difficulties in fully understanding the meaning, but he will at least see that there is a meaning. He will need some agility in taking the leaps needed to keep up with the author. At all events he ought to look at the theses in the introduction as statements to be made good in the body of the work. They are problems to be solved, but it will be well to see what the problems are.

Then in the work itself, the chapters are the Subject, First Principle, the Subject, Reality, Fact, and Cognition, Thought, Unity and Multiplicity, and the Absolute. There are appendices, one on Experience, Religion, Philosophy; a second on Human Knowledge; and a third replies to criticisms of his former work on Great Problems.

It is not possible to set forth in detail the long and intricate argument of the author, though it deserves the closest attention in every step of it. But some conception of the gist of it may be given. Beginning with a brief statement of what he calls objective cognition, he immediately shows that objective cognition, valuable though it is, is not exhaustive. It is abstract, and therefore unequal to the description of the fulness of life or of experience. There remains the whole question of the reference to a subject of knowledge. 'The process of knowing, that is to say an activity which manifests itself in a great number of acts of cognition; that is to say the totality of objective cognitions which result from these acts: the subject, that is to say the centre of irradiation, without which the acts would not be manifestations of one and the same activity: the object, that is to say what in each case opposes itself to the subject as knowing: experience, that is to say the totality of facts which form the matter of the single cognitions,—are elements of one unity, elements which we must distinguish, but not hypostatise' (p. 6). These then are elements in one unity, any one of them taken by itself is an abstraction. The real is the unity of them all. What then is this unity? It is the unity of the subject, which is the centre of its own universe, and each of the elements mentioned above is an element of the subject. But a further inquiry has to be undertaken. What is the subject? The answer is not simple or obvious. 'I only exist in relation to the whole, and the whole exists only in relation to me' (p. 35). Such, in brief, is the conclusion reached by the author at the conclusion of the section called The First Principle. It is a conclusion sufficiently impressive, and the steps of the argument by which the author seeks to establish it deserve attention. Some of these steps are valid, some of them are not so cogent. He postulates a subjective unity to start with, but the postulated unity is not the consciousness of self, but the unity which develops through activity and organization towards explicit self-consciousness. 'The development of self-consciousness necessarily presupposes a primitive unity of consciousness,—a unity which exists in so far as it is not alien, but present to itself, or, in other words, in so far as it is, in an embryonic form, self-conscious.' In this regard the author occasionally indulges in what may be called the natural history of the individual. He describes in quite felicitous terms the evolution of the chicken from the egg, and happily describes the evolution of the primitive unity of consciousness into self-consciousness. It is quite interesting, but it is attended with difficulties. One of these is that the natural history implies that the subject has a beginning and a history; on the other hand the subject is eternal, is the subject of all experience, and as necessary to the whole as

the whole is to it. The author is well aware of the difficulty and seeks to face it, without success. Another difficulty is the relation of the conscious to the subconscious. We are told by the author that 'Consciousness is nothing but subconsciousness organised.' Apparently the original and directive unity is subconsciousness, by it the work is done, and to it the organized consciousness is wholly indebted. The author is aware of the risk involved in the argument. For he warns us that, 'Subconsciousness is not a *Deus ex machina* introduced with the object of eliminating difficulties: that would be an illusive contrivance.' But this is precisely what occurs in many parts of the author's argument. On the whole the larger rôle is played by the subconscious. Nor is it ever shown what benefit arises out of consciousness when it has appeared on the scene. Nor is the reference to memory convincing. For when we strive to recollect any name, and search for it in the domain of the subconscious, the essence of the matter is that when we recognize what we have searched for, we recognize it as something which has been in consciousness before. The subconscious is a warehouse in which is stored what has been already in consciousness.

In the chapter on the Subject the author seeks to show how the primitive unity is developed until it becomes the subject properly so called. Even when we hesitate to follow the author in all his deductions, yet the endeavour to do so is always stimulating and instructive. Quite clear and cogent is the distinction between the relation subject-object, and between (say) Peter and Paul. 'That a developed subject is a constituent of another developed subject is evidently not true. The two consciousnesses are distinct, are two, not as constitutive parts of one and the same consciousness, but as consciousnesses. Therefore, the same reasons, for which the duality subject-object must be resolved into a primitive unity, require that the duality Peter-Paul should be recognised as primitive' (p. 48). Relations between Subjects is the next theme, and it is one to be closely studied. While one consciousness cannot be a part of another, yet the subjects form a system essential to each. It is a system of many centres, each of which is a centre of its own world, yet all of them are bound together into one system. 'One single unity, in course of development, accounts fully for the duality subject-object, since the consciousness of that duality is still one consciousness. But it does not account for the duality Peter-Paul, for though Peter and Paul are inseparable it remains true that Peter's consciousness is different from that of Paul. Peter and Paul may see the same things, but the seeing of Peter is not the seeing of Paul. They both think according to the same laws: but the thinking of the one is not the thinking of the other' (pp. 51–52). It is well to have this distinction made plain, for it is usually disregarded by many thinkers, particularly by those of the idealistic persuasion. The concrete universal is sometimes lacking in concreteness, and the difficulty with all such schemes is that they do not adequately recognize the individual in his individuality. Our author, however, strives for unity, and that unity he finds in a system in which all subjects are, through which they become themselves, and to the building up of which they each contribute. We have found this line of thought to be fruitful.

We should have liked to dwell on the subsequent chapters, more especially on the chapters dealing with Thought, Unity and Multiplicity, and on the Absolute. Let us quote a paragraph from the summary: 'Every subject is a centre of the phenomenal universe, in the unity of all phenomena,—a secondary, that is to say, a particular, unity: *i.e.*, not unique, but one among many ordered among themselves, but still a unity of the whole phenomenal world. This latter is a system of more or less developed subjects. And phenomena are interconnected variations of the single subjects. Every subject varies in so far as its spontaneous variations interfere with those of all the rest, the course of events implies both as logical factors, which are the spontaneities of the single subjects, and a logical factor, on which the interfering of the single spontaneities according to necessary laws depends. The logical factor, on which the necessity of thought is founded, is the supreme unity of the universe—a unity which, while it connects the subjects, is constitutive of each, so that each subject exists only as belonging to the system' pp. (262–263). One remark we make as we close. We are pleased with the fact that the author makes room for a doctrine of the value of the individual, and for a rational doctrine of freedom. For freedom has been attacked from many sides, and the latest has been from the new doctrine of

heredity. The new development of Mendelism leaves no room for freedom or spontaneity. And the doctrine of development, or of nurture versus nature, as set forth in these subtile pages forms a splendid vindication of the possibility of freedom, and of the worth of the individual. It at once provides for the unity of the universe, for the worth of the individual, and for the reality of ideals.

JAMES IVERACH.

Aberdeen.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Chapter viii.

18–22. The corresponding passage in the Babylonian story (where the account of the descent of Utu-napistim himself from the ship has dropped out of the text) is:

I sent (them) forth to the four winds; I offered sacrifice;
I built an altar upon the peak of the mountain;
seven by seven I placed the libation vases;
below them I spread reeds, cedar-wood, and myrtle.
The gods smelled the savour,
the gods smelled the sweet savour,
the gods gathered like flies over the sacrifice.

The literal translation of the line, 'the gods smelled the sweet (*literally* 'the good') savour,' leaves no doubt that the Hebrew translator had the same cuneiform text that we have before him; but, as elsewhere, the polytheism of the Babylonian story becomes monotheistic. As in the Babylonian version, moreover, so in the Hebrew account we have first the animal sacrifice, and then the burnt-offering, which in Babylonia consisted of sweet-smelling woods placed under the sacrificed animal, but here, in accordance with the Mosaic ritual, becomes the *'ôlâh*, or 'burnt (animal) offering.' In accordance also with the Mosaic ritual, 'clean' animals and fowl are selected for the sacrifice, which explains why the clean animals were introduced into the ark (7^2). As they take the place of the libation vases in the Babylonian narrative, we have further an explanation of the statement that these clean animals were taken 'by sevens.'

In the Babylonian poem the gathering of the gods round the sacrifice is followed by Istar's denunciation of Ellil for having caused the deluge, and of the gods who had acted as his ministers; by the anger of Ellil at finding that Utu-napistim had escaped destruction; and by his acceptance of the 'wise' words of Ea that henceforward the individual alone should be responsible for his own sins: 'Lay on the sinner (alone) his sin; lay on the transgressor his transgression; be merciful that he be not cut off, be long-suffering that he be not [destroyed].' All this is necessarily omitted by the Hebrew monotheist, who passes on to the acceptance by Ellil of the counsel of Ea, which was, on the one hand, that the individual, and not 'every thing living,' should suffer for the individual's sins; and, on the other hand, that the punishment inflicted on man for his sins should be confined to man—lions, hyænas, famine, or plague—and not extended, as in the case of the deluge, to the ground. Accordingly, in v.[21], 'Yahweh says to his heart' that the curse inflicted on 'the ground' by the disobedience of Adam and the murder of Cain is finally removed from it, and that He 'will not again smite any more every thing living.' For the meaning of this last passage—that the individual should henceforth bear his own sin—we have to turn to the Babylonian story, the Hebrew writer not having explained it. The Hebrew code which admitted the principle of blood-revenge, and the participation of the community in the guilt of its members, differed from the code of Khammu-rabi, which assumed that the individual was responsible to the law for his actions.

In the Babylonian story there is nothing corresponding with v.[22]. עֹד, *'ôdh*, is the Ass. *adû*, 'the time of all the days of the earth,' and is used as in *adî Nannari*, 'the time of the Moon,' *i.e.* as long as the moon exists. *Yishbôthû* is the Ass. *sabâtu*, 'to keep Sabbath'; a phrase quoted from an early bilingual poem is *sabâtu sa abubi*, 'the keeping sabbath' or 'cessation of the deluge'; see note on

2^3. God's work of creation ended with the Sabbath; but the promise made by Yahweh after the deluge was that the ordinary revolutions of nature should never keep Sabbath again.

Chapter ix.

1. In the Babylonian story, as here, the blessing of Utu-napistim (in which his wife is included) follows the promise of Ellil never again to send a deluge upon the earth. The blessing involves the translation of Utu-napistim and his wife to the Babylonian Paradise; in Genesis this is transferred to the other Adra-khaśiś, or 'Very Wise,' Enoch (see note on 5^{24}). The words of the blessing are taken from 1^{28-30}, with those slight variations which distinguish the Biblical writer from the author of the Assyro-Babylonian Epic of the Creation, who repeats the same passage time after time without alteration. We have here, in fact, a result of the difference between prose and verse, and the freedom the Biblical writer allows himself when quoting an earlier passage of his own work illustrates the similar freedom he allowed himself when translating from a cuneiform original (see note, 8^{6-12}). As the words of the blessing are taken from 1^{28-30}, the sons of Noah are necessarily included in it.

3. 'Namely, that liveth' is an explanatory gloss upon *remesh*, the Ass. *nammassû*, which is used here as if it were *nammastu* (see note on 8^{17}).

In $1^{29.\ 30}$ only 'the green herb' was given as food to man and beast, since no flesh-meat was eaten in Paradise; the expulsion of man from the garden of Eden not only forced him to 'eat bread' 'in the sweat of his face,' but also to have recourse to animal food. Permission to eat the latter is now formally granted, nothing being said about 'clean' and 'unclean' meats. On the contrary, 'all' that has life among the lower animals may be the food of man; the restrictions of the Mosaic Law have not yet come into operation.

4. Blood alone is forbidden to be eaten, for the blood is life (see Lv 17^{11}). That the blood was life was a Babylonian belief, and Berossus tells us that the first men were formed of the earth and the blood of the gods. Zimmern has detected a reference to this myth in a mutilated cuneiform text (C.T. vi.; Bu. 91–5–9, 269; see Jensen, *Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen*, p. 275). The conception that the blood was the life goes back to a different origin from that which identified life with the divine breath (Gn 2^7), though both beliefs were Babylonian, as they were also Hebrew. The Tel el-Amarna writers, for example, call the Pharaoh *sari napisti-ya*, 'the breath of my life.' But the identification of life with the breath was connected with Ea, 'the god of the good wind'; while its identification with the blood was connected with Ellil, or Bel of Nippur, who was said to have cut off 'the heads of himself and the other gods' in order to form a man with blood (see Eusebius, *Chron. Arm.*, ed. Mai, p. 10). Both 'the god of the good wind' and the god who thus formed man from his own blood were subsequently identified with Bel-Merodach when the latter became the creator of the world. In Assyrian the verse would have been *sêru* (or *bisru*) *sa inasu damu ul takulu*.

5, 6. Here we have the principle of blood-revenge, which is embodied in the Mosaic Law, and extends to beast as well as to man (see, *e.g.*, Ex 21^{28}). The recognition of this principle is one of the great points of difference between the Mosaic Code and the Babylonian Code of Khammu-rabi, where its place is taken, as in modern codes, by the doctrine of the supreme authority of the civil law which overrides public feuds and private revenge, and fixes the penalty for every offence. There are no traces of a Babylonian original in v.^{5}. In v.^{6}, however, we again have them, the Assyrian form of the verse being *tabiku damê nisi nisu damê-su itbuk, assum ina tsalam ilâni episu teniseti*. We find the phrase *damê tappê-su ittabak*, 'has he poured out the blood of his companion?' in *W.A.I.* v. 51, 52.

8–17. The covenant of which the rainbow was a 'token' is not referred to in the Babylonian story of the Deluge contained in the Epic of Gilgames. It must have been found, however, in one of the versions of the story current in Babylonian literature, since an early hymn (*W.A.I.* ii. 19. 2, 8) mentions the *qastu sa abubi*, 'bow of the deluge,' where the word used for 'bow' is not the usual Assyrian word *tilpânu*, but one which corresponds with the Heb. *qesheth*. It is possible that 'the story of the bow,' 'lifted up in heaven' by Anu the sky-god, with which Merodach was armed when he fought against Tiamât, was also the rainbow. It will be remembered that in the Biblical narrative *tehôm* or Tiamât plays a leading part in bringing about the flood. 'Every living creature' (vv.$^{12.\ 15}$) is the Ass.

sikin napisti (*kalama*). In v.[11] we have 'the waters of the deluge' as in 7[10]; in v.[16] this is replaced by the Assyrianism לְמַבּוּל הַמַּיִם, which is a literal rendering of the Ass. *mê sa bubbuli*. We may see in the two expressions alternative translations of the same original.

Let us now see how the results of the foregoing analysis harmonize with the current theory which divides the Biblical narrative between an 'Elohist' and a 'Yahwist.' The 'Elohist' agrees with the Babylonian story in the following points:—(1) Noah is the tenth from the first man; (2) the Deluge is dûe to the sins of mankind; (3) all living things are involved in the calamity except such as are preserved in the ark; (4) the deity reveals to Noah the approach of the Deluge and instructs him how to build the ark; (5) the deity prescribes the dimensions of the ark, which is divided into rooms and storeys and pitched within and without; (6) Noah takes his family into the ark with him; (7) the ark has a window; (8) the ark rests on one of the Armenian mountains; (9) after the subsidence of the Deluge, Noah offers sacrifice on the mountain, and God declares that He will not again destroy the world by a flood.

The 'Yahwist' agrees with the Babylonian story in the following points:—(1) The Deluge is a punishment for sin; (2) it destroys all living things except those that were in the ark; (3) the period of seven days is known to him; (4) the Deluge is caused by a downpour of rain; (5) birds are sent from the ark three times in order to ascertain if the earth is dry; (6) two of these birds are the dove and the raven; (7) Noah builds an altar and offers sacrifice after the Deluge, and Yahweh 'smelled the sweet savour.' In other passages the 'Yahwist' shows that he is acquainted with the Babylonian story by changing or contradicting its statements; thus the swallow is omitted in the account of the sending out of the birds, and Yahweh closes the door of the ark instead of Noah himself. Throughout the 'Yahwistic' portions of the narrative, in fact, we have the same evidences of tacit contradiction of the polytheism inherent in the Babylonian story that we have found in Gn 1, which, however, is said to belong to the 'Elohist.' It is in these 'Yahwistic' portions, moreover, that the actual words of the cuneiform text are the most frequently reproduced.

The logical conclusions to be drawn from these facts are given in my *Early History of the Hebrews*. I have there said (p. 125): 'It will be noticed that the coincidences between the Babylonian and Hebrew narratives are quite as much in details as in general outlines, and these coincidences cover the Hebrew narrative as a whole. It is not with the Elohist or with the Yahwist alone that the Babylonian poet agrees, but with the supposed combination of their two documents as we now find it in the Book of Genesis. If the documentary hypothesis were right, there would be only two ways of accounting for this fact. Either the Babylonian poet (who lived in the Abrahamic age) had before him the present "redacted" text of Genesis, or else the Elohist and Yahwist must have copied the Babylonian story upon the mutual understanding that the one should insert what the other omitted. There is no third alternative. In order to explain the phenomena of the Hebrew text we must therefore have recourse to some other hypothesis than that which finds in it the work of an "Elohist" and a "Yahwist."'

The detailed comparison of it with the version of the Babylonian story contained in the Epic of Gilgames has shown that—

(1) Behind the Biblical account lie the Babylonian versions of the story.

(2) One of these, which has been translated into Hebrew, is the version which we have in the Epic of Gilgames.

(3) This is shown not only by the translations, but still more by the omissions and tacit contradictions of the Babylonian account on the part of the Hebrew translator.

(4) Another account in Babylonian cuneiform, which has also been translated, was written in Palestine, or at all events from the point of view of an inhabitant of Palestine.

(5) The translations are free, and characterized by explanatory amplifications which remind us of the Mishna.

(6) Alternative translations of the Babylonian original occur, producing at times a 'conflate' text or the insertion of a word or words in the wrong place.

(7) In certain passages we find the language of the Tel el-Amarna tablets (e.g. *sâru napisti*, *tsukhru*, etc.).

(8) The narrative, as we have it, is a consecutive whole which corresponds with the Babylonian account, and displays throughout one spirit and aim.

(9) The inconsistencies discoverable in it are due to intentional alteration of the Babylonian account.

(10) The text has undergone but little change since the Septuagint translation was made.

Contributions and Comments.

'Conflict in Prayer.'

Too cold in prayer, we miss the promise given
Of Victory, which wrestling saints attain;
Which Abraham secured on Mamre's plain;
Which Jacob at Penuel won from God.
Our slothful, careless souls, in slumber nod,
When there awaits their energies such gain
As God delights to give! Why then refrain
From passionate prayer which triumphs over Heaven?

WILLIAM OLNEY, *Deacon.*

Metropolitan Tabernacle, London.

The Denial of St. Peter.

No fair estimate of a historical character can be founded upon mere assumption. Now, though the fact of St. Peter's denial is recorded by all the Evangelists, his motives are explained by none. Why should it be confidently assumed that his reason was a cowardly fear of arrest and punishment, especially when we know him to have affirmed, not long before, that he would welcome such a fate by his Master's side? Many human heroes have won the love of faithful friends. Jesus must surely, contrary to our beliefs, have been a poor judge of human character, or He must have deliberately selected His disciples from the weakest men of Palestine, if the bravest of them all, the man whom He honoured with the surname of 'Rock,' was so weak and waterish at the critical hour. St. Peter's resolution to go with our Lord to prison and to judgment was not of an extraordinary nature. If the companionship of Jesus was at all inspiring, it is exactly what we should have expected from one who had already left all to follow Him. We have proof enough that he intended to be true to his promise. His action with the sword in the garden, his refusal to follow the other disciples in their flight, his arrival at the courtyard of the high priest's house, all show that he had not forgotten his words: 'Though all forsake thee, yet will not I.' There is surely more reason for assuming that his denial was due to his desire to remain by Christ's side than to a mere cowardly fear of imprisonment.

The facts recorded by the Evangelists bear out this hypothesis. No Gospel conveys the slightest hint of any intention on the part of the Sanhedrin to apprehend the disciples with their Master. The members of the band sent out by the priest were sufficiently numerous and well armed to have encircled the Galileans and to have made their escape impossible, had this course been deemed advisable by their officers. Apparently their orders were to seize the Leader alone since they required the services of Judas to identify Him by a kiss. When asked their designs they mentioned no other name save that of Jesus of Nazareth. Christ Himself interpreted their answer as an assurance of His followers' safety, nor did they demur at His request, 'If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way.' St. Peter made himself sufficiently conspicuous in the garden. His attack upon Malchus was a challenge to the high priest's minions to arrest him. His action could scarcely have been overlooked unless they had received strict injunctions to leave every one but Jesus unmolested. Such a command is quite intelligible considering what we know of the perplexity of the rulers and their fear of any action likely to arouse strife among the populace (Mk 14^{11} and Lk 22^{53}).

We notice that the companion of St. Peter had some pass to admit him to the high priest's house. If this 'other disciple' was, as we think most probable, Judas, the circumstance is in no way remarkable and throws no light upon the present question. If, however, this companion was St. John, the fact that the disciples were in no danger of capture seems proved beyond question. The

absence of all Scriptural censure shows that St. John made no denial of the Lord either by word or deed. He was in the high priest's courtyard as an avowed disciple. His character would not have stooped to any duplicity. If then he had been in any danger of trial for his life, could his friendship with the priest have saved him? The acquaintance was in all probability very slight. It could scarcely have protected him from the course of justice, but this much it might have done—it might have secured him an entrance which would have been refused to an unknown character, especially to an unknown follower of the Nazarene. It is conceivable that a little 'back-stairs influence,' such as a man could acquire in the pursuit of a fisherman's craft, might win him the privilege of being allowed admission where others of his persuasion were forbidden, but even the greatest personal friendship in high quarters would not have given him liberty to flaunt his presence in the eyes of the soldiers, if they had orders to capture him and his associates. Thus if St. John was St. Peter's companion we must regard it as certain that the disciples were not liable to arrest.

The real difficulty was apparently to get into the courtyard. St. Peter was challenged at the door. His first denial secured him admission from the porteress (Jn 18^{17}). Hence we may conclude that his repeated asseverations were designed to save him from ejection. Had there been any warrant out for the arrest of the disciples, the case of St. Peter would not have been treated so lightly by those who noted his strange conduct. His Galilæan speech, his recognition by the brother of Malchus, and his exchange of looks with the Master were all highly suspicious circumstances. If he were arraignable on a capital charge, his case was treated with remarkable apathy. When, finally, he burst into tears and fled, every one must have known that he had been lying, yet he was not pursued. If he had been 'wanted' by the Sanhedrin, he would surely have been followed and brought back. No difficulty was put in the way of his retiral. In fact, we feel that his exit was followed by a burst of mocking laughter. The servants of the high priest were completely satisfied when he left the courtyard, this being the aim of all their cross-examination.

We conclude, then, that St. Peter did not fear these underlings who tormented him with their questions. They were to him like a swarm of malicious flies. He knew that his discovery, as a disciple, would cause his instant ejection from the place, where he desired to be. He had lied to secure his admission, and he continued to lie in order that he might remain by his Master's side. He lied, not at all like a man afraid, but impatiently, petulantly, and roughly. There was no cringing or obsequiousness in the manner of his speech. His curses were the anger of a man who desired peace from a petty persecution, not of one who swore for the sake of his life. The lies and denials floated over the surface of his mind, but deep down in his heart was the feeling that he was being true to his great resolve, 'Though all forsake thee, yet will not I.' It would be a great psychological puzzle if he could be proved to have forgotten that promise, so recently made. Our Lord's warning, that he should beware of boasting lest some twelve or twenty-four hours should find him ready for denial, had only made him more emphatic (Mk 14^{31}). Rightly received, the caution might have served as a tonic, and was probably designed as such. It succeeded, however, only in making St. Peter somewhat unthinkingly stubborn. He repeated his resolution until the necessity of remaining by the Master's side became almost an obsession. Had he been afraid, he would have lied to the porteress and immediately sought some way of escape from his dangerous situation. As it was, cheated of the arrest he sought by the action of Christ and of the soldiers, he continued to be true to the letter of his promise until he contradicted its spirit. Eager to go with his Master to prison and to judgment he consented to be separated from Him in heart by such a declaration as, 'I know not the man.' The vehemence of his testimony to his own loyalty made him an apostate. This explanation fits in with what we know of the character of the man. His usual faults were not cowardice and vacillation, but impetuosity and self-will. We have abundant evidence that our Lord considered him headstrong: 'When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest.' A man of this nature should not be believed guilty of pusillanimous wavering except upon the strongest evidence, but, as we have sought to show, the Gospels do not provide us with any reason to believe that his actions on the night of the betrayal were due to anything else than his usual impetuosity. They show us, not a

strong will, curbed and cowed by the fear of death, but a hot-headed man, determined to have his own way by means fair or foul.

We believe, then, that St. Peter's famous lapse was the result of self-will grown stubborn, proud, and impatient, and not at all of cowardice. His disloyalty was a fault much more refined than that of which he is commonly accused, but it was sufficiently dishonourable to wring the tears of penitence from his heart. He learned the lesson of his fall, for, afterwards, in answer to our Lord's question, 'Art thou more loyal than these?' he answered not, 'Though all should forsake thee, yet will not I,' but modestly, humbly, and brokenly, 'Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.'

W. D. GARDINER.

Saint Madoes Manse, Glencarse, Perth.

A Solution of the Chief Difficulties in Revelation xx.–xxii.

THAT there are, if not extraneous sources of the matter, at any rate stages or strata in the thought of these chapters, appears from such data as the two descriptions of the divine city;[1] and in view of the confusion and obscurity apparent in the synthesis, it was to be expected that the attempt to rearrange the text would eventually be made, as one among the number of possible solutions. Nor is there any *a priori* objection to this particular method of solution, which has often been employed in Biblical exegesis.

The further question is whether the particular scheme of rearrangement proposed by Canon Charles is satisfactory. One link in the chain of exegetical argument struck me as weak. The question, What becomes of the first city? is insufficiently answered in Canon Charles's reconstruction.

Not content, however, with merely indicating the defect, I should like to contribute something towards making it good.

Let us look more closely at the first city—for the moment accepting Dr. Agar Beet's statement that Canon Charles has, in fact, divided the one city, heretofore recognized, into two. According to Canon Charles, the first city is depicted in 21^{9-27} $22^{1.2}$ $22^{14.15.17}$; and in the final mention of it, in 20^{9}, it is called 'the beloved city.'

Now it seems to me that Canon Charles's commentary (in the magazine) exhibits at this point a confusion of ideas which his text avoids. He calls *this* city 'the New Jerusalem.' That is just what, according to the text, it is not. It is the *second* city, which appears after the judgment and upon the new earth, that is called 'the New Jerusalem.' The epithet καινή does not appear in the first description at all.

In truth, the first city, however much blessed and divinely illumined, is still mundane. Dr. Moffatt had already detected the fundamental earthliness of the description in 21^{9}–22^{5} (rather ^{2}).[2] This city symbolizes the idealized Church of the present world-order. All that Jerusalem has ever in history represented of the truth, righteousness, and love of God, striving to evangelize the present world, stands before us in the description of the first city. In the thought of the section, men have come universally to recognize the Church and her mission; yet not always with a loving recognition. They hear her invitation; yet not always with a responsive ear.

For it is to be observed—J. Weiss and others have called attention to this fact—that the beloved city is situated on the earth, indeed, but on the highest part of it. The forces of evil go up against her in their final effort.

This determining of the city's situation is in itself significant eschatologically. It is a transitional feature. We perceive in it a prevision of the development which the Apocalyptist is about to announce.

As these forces mount to the attack, the storm of divine judgment sweeps over the heaven and earth, which retreat, or rather disappear into nothingness before it. Not so the beloved city. It stands firm on its eminence. That is the last sight we get of it before the clouds and fires of judgment hide it from our view.

When the storm is over, the city appears again. Now, however, it is καινή; it shines forth 'in neuer Gestalt.'

There seems to have been much speculation in the Apocalyptic era, as to whether, at the end of the world-age, Jerusalem was to be re-established and rebuilt, or transformed, or removed and replaced by an entirely new Jerusalem. In Ezk 40^{2} the

[1] See J. Weiss, in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, B. ii. S. 680. Göttingen.

[2] Moffatt, *Lit. New Test.*, p. 495.

Temple, as the centre of יהוה שמה, *i.e.* the restored Jerusalem fully and permanently indwelt by God, is rebuilt on the ancient mountain.[1] In Deutero-Isaiah, Jerusalem is not merely, as in Ezekiel, rebuilt and rearranged, but transfigured.[2] The latter writer, however, was far in advance of his age in largeness and spirituality of view; and some of the subsequent Apocalyptists not only made no further progress but retrograded, in their speculations on the destiny of Jerusalem. In the forecast of the Psalms of Solomon,[3] the city is to be restored as it was at first; and similarly in the Sybilline Oracles.[4] In the Book of Tobit, the imagination is exercised on the adornment of the restored Jerusalem,[5] the sense of beauty manifested in Deutero-Isaiah is revived, and preparation is made for the expansion of the idea of adornment in the Johannine Apocalypse. The ideas of fundamental transformation, transfigurement, and newness are not, however, present in the Book of Tobit.

2 Esdras gives the conception of the restoration of Jerusalem a mystical turn. The city, by an act of transformation, appears suddenly on a void stage.[6] In the Syrian Apocalypse of Baruch, the old Jerusalem is represented as shaken down and temporarily rebuilt; again overthrown, and finally renewed in everlasting glory.[7] The Apocalyptic has by this time travelled some way along the lines of newness and transformation in connexion with Jerusalem; though, as above hinted, it has produced nothing up to the literary and inspirational standard of Deutero-Isaiah.

It remains to notice the Enochian speculations. Crude indeed they are, but radical in their penetration. In En 90, the old Jerusalem is not transformed, but wrapped up and carried away, and a new house (city) is brought in its place.

We come now to the teaching of our Apocalypse about Jerusalem. A note in the Italian commentary published by the Società Fides et Amor (Roma) gives us a clue to the attitude of the New Testament Apocalyptist towards the speculations just referred to. This commentator says that the Apocalyptist is combining the two ideas of the limited and mundane, and of the eternal and supramundane Messianic reigns. He is likewise fusing the various notions of the re-establishment of Jerusalem. This consideration disposes of the objection made by Dr. Agar Beet, that Canon Charles's interpretation introduces two cities where one has hitherto been recognized by Biblical students. For we are, in fact, confronted, not with two cities, but with two eschatological aspects, one mundane, the other supramundane, of one city.

The fact that the phrase 'coming down out of heaven from God' occurs in both descriptions is at first sight strange, and suggestive of redactorial confusion or interpolation. On reflexion, however, it will be seen to constitute a due connecting link. For the phrase is not to be understood spatially or locally. It is the generic title of Jerusalem, expressive of her relation to God; applicable not less to her mundane[8] than to her supramundane aspect. In either case, she has a mission from God.

Thus, in fine, just as the earthly mission of Jesus Christ ended in failure, and it is in His supramundane life that He achieves victory—as the theological truths of the Resurrection and the Ascension symbolize and declare; so to the evangelizing Church is granted no prevision of triumph in this world-order; for the activity of her enemies continues to the end. But she is promised fulness of success in another world-order. Her broken arcs of this life will be completed, and become perfect rounds in a life beyond.

Fulness of success. I had chosen the words deliberately before writing them down; yet it is only timidly and feebly that the mind can grasp their significance. Is it credible, this which the scheme of reconstruction implies—that the closing scenes of the Apocalypse really foretell the complete victory of the gospel; really anticipate a total newness of the universe in which no such painful and ugly facts of consciousness as we now experience shall any longer exist, when they shall have been burnt up as fuel in the world-process, and have become transformed, unrecognizable, forgotten, as burning wood passes into gas? Do they, indeed, announce the coming of another world-order, wherein the one recognizable link with the painful past shall be the Church, the mystical Body of the Redeemer; and the new heaven and earth shall fill all things, and nothing shall exist but what can live in harmony with them?

[1] Cp. Davidson, *in loc.*
[2] See v. Orelli, *O.T. Prophecy*, p. 413.
[3] 17^{30}. [4] $5^{414ff.}$ [5] $13^{16f.}$
[6] $10^{25ff.}$ [7] Ch. 32.

[8] The idea appears in connexion with the idealized mundane Jerusalem, in He 11^{10}.

Surely, many will urge, such thoroughgoing universalism goes beyond Scripture, rather than completes it; nay, does it not stand condemned by the Apocalypse itself? For does not this line of reconstructive exegesis merely evade, not solve, that other eschatological problem, the duration of the Lake of Fire?

Well, let us face the facts, or rather one great, outstanding eschatological fact, which emerges from Canon Charles's scheme of reconstruction. It is that at the close of the Millennium, the Lake of Fire, into which have been thrown whatever spiritual agencies of evil are covered by the symbols Satan, the Beast, the False Prophet, and also all the unconverted, regarded as instruments of those agencies, sinks out of sight in the new creation. It is no longer mentioned. What should be inferred from this fact? That it still burns beneath the surface, under the foundations? Or that it no longer exists?

It is significant that at this stage the author at any rate exhibits no tendency, as he has previously done (in ch. 14), to exult over the punitive sufferings of the lost.[1] There is even some doubt whether the references to the Book of Life in $20^{11\text{-}15}$ are not glosses. They suit ill with the rest of the thought.

But however this may be, it becomes clear on closer inspection that the eschatology of these concluding chapters tells us only that the punishment of evil will continue as long as evil exists. The connotation of the expression εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων is indefiniteness. It does not exclude, but neither does it obtrude, the idea of endless duration. Æonian duration could not, in fact, according to scriptural usage, *essentially* connote endlessness; for that usage admits, in connexion with God's existence, the expression πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων; and the obvious implication is that God is not tied to the æonian system. He could eliminate it from the universal order.

An important, but usually ignored, distinction has in fact to be drawn between the notional and the actual existence of the conditions symbolized by the Lake of Fire. As I hope to show in a forthcoming article in *The Modern Churchman*, the eternal hell in Christian doctrine is an idea. By its predication, the Church means that evil will be punished as long as is needful. *If* there existed infinite and absolute evil, there would be infinite and absolute punishment likewise; and all the sensational language that has ever been used by preachers on this subject would be inadequate to present its horror. That is the governing idea of ethical religion. But then, absolute evil does *not* exist as fact; and faith in the infinite goodness of God assures us that it never will exist as fact.

Canon Charles's discovery of the plan of these chapters must be classed as one of those events which will exercise a determining influence on the theology of the future. Christian thought has of late been tending more and more to the acceptance of ethical universalism as the solution of the problem of eternal punishment.[2]

Now at length the vision of that consummation unfolds itself to us, in a literary setting where we had not looked for it, in the most fiercely polemical book of the divine library of Scripture, where the hatred of evil becomes so intense that divines and exegetes have ere now shrunk from it appalled. In the light of this reconstruction we can endure and even welcome this revealing of unmitigated, glowing indignation. We know that, as it comes before us in this book, it is an ideal. It is an essential part of that whole creative scheme which admits ethical processes, and which in its infinite fulness includes the ideal as well as the actual world. And we now perceive that the concrete realizations of this ideal will not only not disappoint, they will aid in fulfilling, the original design of creative love. The final vision of the Apocalypse, as it now comes before us, is glorious with undimmed glory. It assures us that the universe is perfectible, and will be perfected. It seals up the sum of the manifold message of revelation, with a forecast that is at once perfect in wisdom and perfect in beauty.

H. NORTHCOTE.

Boulogne-sur-Mer.

[1] Cp. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 677.

[2] Principal Garvie, in Hastings' *ERE.*, art. 'Christianity,'

Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

PROBABLY the most generally accepted explanation of the phrase is that it was due to a bilingual period in the Church, when the formula was familiar. It thus superseded the simple Ἀββά, or ὁ πατήρ, came into the early Christian vocabulary, and thus into the Epistle to the Romans (8^{15}) and the Second Gospel (14^{36}). If this were so the omission of the formula in the Gospel parallels

would be inexplicable. The editors of Mt. and Lk. would not hesitate to change Mk.'s phraseology, but they would scarcely drop one-half of an established Church formula. It is possible that these editors regarded the words as mere iteration, according to a Galilæan colloquialism (cf. מרי כירי, *vide* Schöttgen *ad loc.*), and they avoided the tautology. Matthew writes *πάτερ μου* only (26^{39}), and Luke *πάτερ* only (22^{42}). If the second term were a mere interpretation of the first, we should expect a different construction. The writer of Mk., after his custom, would have used the familiar *ὃ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον* (cf. 5^{41}), or simply *ὃ ἐστιν* (cf. 7^{34}), before *πατήρ*. Behind the Greek phrase, we suggest, there were two Aramaic words, or rather two forms of one word, viz. אבא and אבי. In the vernacular pronunciation there was probably little distinction in the sound of these two words, inasmuch as the final vowels were unuttered, or uttered indistinctly. In terms of personal address, however, the final vowels were better enunciated (cf. רבי, *Ραββί*, and רבוני, *Ραββουνεί*), and we may suppose that there was at least a slight difference in sound between אבא and אבי. It is to be observed that אבא was frequently used for 'my father' (Targ. Onk. *saepe*), and even for 'our father' (Talmud, *infrequens*). The suffixed form, however, was in use (cf. אבי, Dn 5^{13}), but became more rare in post-Christian times. It is interesting to notice that in some Phœnician inscriptions the form אבי means 'his father' (*vide C.I.S.* i. 58; Brit. Mus., Cyprus Room, No. 31). From the iteration אבא אבא we could get either *πάτερ, πάτερ*, or *πάτερ μου, πάτερ μου*. But the variants in the First and Third Gospels are against this interpretation. The expression was evidently a memorable one in the Apostolic Church; not only unique, but impressive and wonderful. We are tempted to accept the Syriac (the dialect most akin to the Aramaic of Palestine) form of the phrase, ܐܒܝ ܐܒܐ, as best preserving the original. The prayer of Jesus was therefore in effect: 'Father (אבא)! My Father (אבי)!' The variants, *πάτερ* (Lk.) and *πάτερ μου* (Mt.), certainly favour this suggestion, and together they make up the Greek phrase required: *πάτερ, μάτερ μου*.

J. Courtenay James.

Harrogate.

A Problem in Jeremiah.

In the Book of Jeremiah there is a section which begins with 21^{11} and ends with 22^{30}, and which probably bore the original title לְבֵית מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה, 'concerning the royal house.' In it are preserved several short but pregnant oracles containing the prophet's verdict on the successive kings under whom he lived, and implicitly his view of the functions of the kingly office in Judah. To read this, especially in connexion with the relative passages from the Book of Kings, makes one concur heartily in Duhm's regret that the history of the kingdom of Judah was not written for us by Jeremiah.

Within the section, however, occur two short passages ($21^{13.14}$ 22^{20-23}) which have long raised doubts as to whether they have any bearing on the kings, their character or their fate. What I wish to urge here is that these passages really belong together, refer to the same subject, and are wholly out of place in their present position.

The earlier of the two consists of two verses ($21^{13f.}$), where quite evidently a community, described as 'dweller in the plain, the rock of the tableland,' is addressed. The community is thought of as self-satisfied and self-confident, for they are represented as saying, 'Who shall come down against us, who shall penetrate to our abode?' The unsuitable position of the verses has been long and widely recognized: thus Dr. Driver regarded them as having been originally directed against some city other than Jerusalem, and as having been inserted here by an editor who made the mistake of thinking that Jerusalem was meant.

The latter of the two consists of four verses 22^{20-23}, and in it again a community is addressed. The people are summoned to lament their fate on elevated places as at 3^{21}, and the three heights selected for the purpose are Lebanon, Bashan, and Abarim. Their lovers or allies (cf. 4^{30}) are broken: the wind is to shepherd their shepherds: their lovers are to go into captivity. The people, again described as dwelling in Lebanon and nesting among cedars, are to moan over a calamity which falls on them like the sudden pain of child-birth. Here the consensus of opinion for separating the verses from the following oracle on the fate of Jehoiachin is not so unanimous, for a considerable body of opinion thinks it possible that Jerusalem is here summoned to lament over the captivity of its king. There are obvious difficulties in the way:

thus, such a method of introducing the verdict on Jehoiachin is unlike the abrupt pointed method of the other oracles; Jerusalem's allies in 597 were hard to find; it is not easy to conceive the community of Judah as very deeply afflicted over the fate of the eighteen-year-old lad who had maintained his throne for only three months.

Now 22^{20-23} forms a natural sequel to $21^{13f.}$ in sense. After Yahweh has smitten the people (21^{14b}), they are summoned to lament their fate (22^{20}), because they are now helpless (vv.$^{21f.}$), and because their God has given them up (v.^{23}). It forms a natural sequel, because the same community is addressed. That community is described (21^{13}) as יֹשֶׁבֶת הָעֵמֶק צוּר הַמִּישׁוֹר, 'inhabitant of the vale, rock of the tableland'—a curious phrase, since it is not easy to see what the rock of a tableland is, nor how an abode can be at once in a rock and a vale. Yet the versions give no variation from the M.T., for while the LXX translate צור by Tyre, that implies no departure from the text. The difficulty lies in צור, for plain and tableland are supported by the boast of the community, 'who shall come *down* against us?' and are set in similar parallel in Jer 48^{8}. But המישור has the special sense of the plateau which lies between the Arnon and Heshbon (Dt 3^{10} 4^{43}, Jos $13^{9.\ 16.\ 17.\ 21}$ 20^{8}, Jer 48^{21}); and for the vale to perish, the plateau to be ruined, is in Jer 48^{8} equivalent to the destruction of Moab.

With this situation, across Jordan, agrees the description of the community in 22^{20-23}. The people are bidden go up to lament on Lebanon, Bashan, and Abarim, which describe the heights reaching down Eastern Palestine and ending with that chain of which Mt. Nebo was the commanding summit. The further description 'thou that inhabitest Lebanon, and makest thy nest among the cedars' remains difficult, but at least possible. The common interpretation, which understands that the people felt themselves as safe as if they dwelt on the northern mountains or nested among its cedars, has always seemed to me unexampled and somewhat forced.

The moral situation is also the same. The community, which is addressed in both passages, is full of self-confidence through its situation and its friends; but it has forgotten the peril which arises from having Yahweh as its enemy. It has boasted how none can break into its safe isolation, and how many are its allies. Its ruin will come in a sudden agony like child-birth pangs.

It is not necessary to insist how unlike such a situation is to the friendless condition in which Judah found itself at the time of Jehoiachin, when Northern Israel was already exiled and all the gates of the country stood open to its enemies.

ADAM C. WELCH.

New College, Edinburgh.

Entre Nous.

Illustrations from the War.

The Editor offers a set of the *Great Texts of the Bible* (twenty volumes), or their equivalent in other books chosen from Messrs. T. & T. Clark's catalogue, for the best series of illustrations of the Bible on religious and ethical topics from incidents connected with the War. He offers also a set of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible* (six volumes)—or their equivalent as before—for the second best series. The texts or topics illustrated should be given, and the source of the illustration, together with the date.

The illustrations should be sent before the end of August. They must refer to incidents occurring not earlier than February.

Kabir.

One Hundred Poems of Kabir have been translated by Rabindranath Tagore, with the assistance of Evelyn Underhill (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). Kabir was born in or near Benares, of Mohammedan parents, probably about the year 1440. In early life he became a disciple of the celebrated Hindu ascetic Rāmānanda. He became himself a mystic—one of 'that small group of supreme mystics,' says Miss Underhill, 'amongst whom St. Augustine, Ruysbroeck, and the Sūfī poet Jalālu'ddīn Rūmī are perhaps the chief—who have achieved that which we might call the synthetic vision of God.'

One average quotation will give a taste of the mysticism, the poetry and the translation:

All things are created by the Om;
The love-form is His body.
He is without form, without quality, without decay
Seek thou union with Him!

But that formless God takes a thousand form
in the eyes of His creatures:
He is pure and indestructible,
His form is infinite and fathomless,
He dances in rapture, and waves of form arise
from His dance,
The body and the mind cannot contain them-
selves, when they are touched by His great joy.
He is immersed in all consciousness, all joys,
and all sorrows;
He has no beginning and no end;
He holds all within His bliss.

Maurice Maeterlinck.

Mr. Bernard Miall has translated into English the early poems of Maeterlinck. The title is simply *Poems* (Methuen; 5s. net).

'It is safe to assert,' says the translator, 'that the writer of these poems had read his Verlaine, his Rimbaud, his Mallarmé, and his Baudelaire, and of English-speaking poets Emerson, Poe, perhaps Rossetti, and above all Whitman. But he is no disciple; and his essential originality, and the keynote of his æsthetics, is a system of symbolism.'

What the Symbols signify it is beyond Mr. Miall's skill to certify, and he cannot ask Maeterlinck because 'his country is being crucified by the powers of darkness, and he has other and sterner matters to think of.'

The metre of the original is mostly that of 'In Memoriam,' but the translator has claimed some freedom. This is one of the lyrics as he has 'done' it:

PRAYER.

Thou know'st, O Lord, my spirit's dearth:
Thou see'st the worth of what I bring:
The evil blossoms of the earth,
The light upon a perished thing.

Thou see'st my sick and weary mood:
The moon is dark, the dawn is slain.
Thy glory on my solitude
Shed Thou like fructifying rain.

Light Thou, O Lord, beneath my feet
The way my weary soul should pass,
For now the pain of all things sweet
Is piteous as the ice-bound grass.

The Brontës.

Under the title of *Brontë Poems*, Mr. A. C. Benson has published a selection from the poetry of Charlotte, Emily, Anne, and Branwell Brontë (Smith, Elder & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). In his introduction, which has the charm of his best writing, he gives his opinion freely on the merits of the poetry, and compares the one member of the family with the other. His order is Emily, Branwell, Charlotte, Anne. He speaks also of the attitude to life of each of them. 'Branwell alone of the four had no moral patience, no power of defiance. Emily achieved it by her lofty independence of spirit, Charlotte by courage and tenacious interest in life, Anne by a deep religious faith. But I believe Branwell to have possessed the artistic vision, though an early corruption of temperament leading to a base gaiety was fatal to all clearness and energy of presentment.'

The difficulty with the text of the poems is very great owing to 'the fact that the script of the original MSS is so minute as to be often hardly decipherable.'

Opposite page 210 a specimen of Emily's handwriting is given; and it is amusing to observe that Mr. Benson has deciphered the date amiss. He says May 13, 1843: it is certainly May 15. This is the poem:

Why ask to know what date, what clime?
There dwelt our own humanity,
Power-worshippers from earliest time,
Feet-kissers of triumphant crime,
Crushers of helpless misery,
Crushing down Justice, honouring wrong,
If that be feeble, this be strong.

Shedders of blood, shedders of tears,
Fell creatures avid of distress;
Yet mocking heaven with senseless prayers
For mercy on the merciless.

It was the autumn of the year
When grain grows yellow in the ear;
Day after day, from noon to noon,
That August's sun blazed bright as June.

But we with unregarding eyes
Saw panting earth and glowing skies.
No hand the reaper's sickle held,
Nor bound the bright sheaves in the field.

Our corn was garnered months before,
Threshed out and harvested with gore;
Ground when the ears were milky sweet
With furious toil of hoofs and feet;
I, doubly cursed, on foreign sod,
Fought neither for my home nor God.

Tales from the Trenches.

Mr. James W. Herries has reprinted some sketches of war incidents contributed by him to the newspapers. He calls the book *Tales from the Trenches* (Hodge; 1s. net). Among the rest there is an extraordinary story of three men belonging to the Irish Fusiliers who were on their way to a bayonet attack. 'The three comrades advance

abreast. A shell screams through the air. It passes and leaves the Belfast man headless. His two companions note instantaneously what has happened, but the momentum of the charge carries them on, *and the headless Fusilier charges with them.*

'That grim horror of a headless body, rifle and bayonet still held in position, runs on, step for step, along with the others, for a distance of some 15 yards, before it collapses and falls a huddled heap on the ground.

'It is an incident fit to try the nerves of the strongest. At the moment, however, its weird effect is lost in the tumult and excitement of the charge. It is only after the trenches have been stormed that the strangeness of this headless corpse, charging over the battlefield, with levelled rifle, comes home to the others.

'The story was told me by the six-foot Irishman, an unimpressionable and matter-of-fact soldier type, who described the incident to me as something curious, but not particularly appalling. Many members of the hospital staffs, to whom I have told the story, have found it not at all surprising. The muscular action continuing after the control of the brain had been removed, and the general circumstances in which the incident occurred, fully account for what happened. From my knowledge of the Irishman, and his complete want of the imaginative faculty, I can personally vouch for his credibility.'

Great Deeds of the Great War.

What is the indispensable literature of the War? Among the rest, *T.P.'s Journal of Great Deeds* must find a place for the human element. *T.P.'s Journal of Great Deeds* is not a repertoire of anecdotes, that and nothing more. There are sustained articles by Rudyard Kipling, Archibald Hurd, W. Douglas Newton, T. Miller Maguire, and others, including, of course, T. P. O'Connor himself. And there are numerous photographs, well chosen and well prepared. Nevertheless the incidents and the anecdotes are at least a good spice to the pudding, and out of the first volume, which has just been published, we shall quote three of the most characteristic.

PURE WOMANLY.

'A woman ran out of the door of a solitary cottage towards Senlis, waving her arm. One stops quickly these days. A man was dying inside. She had burned his uniform; but I knew at once he was a German. He had been shot while scouting, had hid himself, and crawled to her house. We did what we could for him. We left him to die in the care of the woman who had not "passed by on the other side." Her son would visit her shortly, and would bury him in the field. No one else was to know!'

THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

'The —th Corps has a Roman Catholic chaplain well known as the Père Narp, and a Jewish Rabbi, Mr. G. R. Ginsburger. They are excellent friends, and are equally distinguished for the good they do. One evening they had stayed too late, tending the wounded and dying in the field, to be able to re-enter the cantonments. They found a deserted cottage with a truckle bed, and both threw themselves down upon it, the Père Narp remarking, with sly wit, "What a pity, all the same, that there is not a photographer to take the Old and New Testament as bedfellows!"'

A BABY.

'The Germans had turned all the people out of a burning village, and rain fell in torrents. Bombardier Stoddard, 27th Battery of the R.F.A., found a baby crying in its cradle during a terrible moment, when he arrived with others at a village subjected to the usual desolation by the German invaders, and made a great effort to save its life. He carried it under his great-coat for five and a half miles, until the battery was about to go into action again. He laid the child under a hayrick, and covered it, in the hope that some one would find it and take care of it. But when the battery passed through the village afterwards he found that the hayrick had been destroyed by fire, and the child could not be found.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Henry R. Ridcock, East Dereham.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A SERMON on Judas Iscariot does not arrest the attention now so easily as once it did. For it is no longer possible to take literally the words of Christ that Judas had a devil. We are not sure now if any one has a devil. We are not quite sure if a devil exists. Nor are we able any longer to say that sheer greed was Judas Iscariot's undoing. We have lifted him up much nearer to the level of ordinary humanity. He is not so bad as he used to be. He is not swayed by so single a motive. As a man, he engages men's attention still, but he does not engage it so surely as he did when a devil.

There is also another and a greater difficulty. It is the difficulty the preacher himself has in reaching a clear conception of the moral character of Judas. It is fifty years since DE QUINCEY'S famous essay on Judas Iscariot was published. It is still longer since Archbishop WHATELY preached and published his startling sermon. And although these sketches of the traitor have often been described as attempts at 'whitewashing,' they have had a mighty influence upon subsequent estimates of his character. No one will contend that Judas differed from Peter only in being a better patriot, but in nearly all the recent literature Judas *is* a patriot. The genius of DE QUINCEY has apparently dismissed the fiend incarnate and left a man with a mixture of motives. The preacher finds it difficult to thread his way among these motives. But he also finds that the study of the career of Judas is now worth the trouble it gives. For it is no longer possible for those who hear to thank God that they are not as this Judas.

The three questions that have to be answered are, how Judas came to be an apostle, why he fell, and what was his end.

To the first question the old answer was as simple as all the rest. Judas took his place among the Twelve 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled.' One of the Scriptures was, 'Mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me' (Ps 41^9). Judas had no escape. That was his destiny, and he had to fulfil it. Now we know that it is not so. God is no such respecter of persons. Even LIDDON, with that loyalty to the written word which made him so powerful a preacher, has passed from such a conception. 'If our Lord,' he says, 'looking down upon our life with His Divine Intelligence, speaks of Judas, once and again, as an instrument whereby the Redemption of the world was to be worked out, the Gospel history also supplies us with materials which go to show that Judas had his freedom of choice, his opportunities, his warnings, and that he became the Betrayer because he chose to do so.'

But then begin our difficulties. Why did Jesus call Judas, and why did Judas come? The answer of all the recent writers is that Judas was not at the beginning so bad as we have supposed him to be, and that Jesus called him just because he was not bad. Did Jesus not know, then? Did He not know what Judas would become? That also is one of the difficulties now. It is a long time since any one has been found to say as plainly as Professor BLUNT said, that 'deliberately and of settled purpose Jesus tolerated the presence of this unfaithful follower,' and that 'it made a part of the wise counsel of God that of the number of the twelve one should be a devil.' Some seem to think that Jesus did not know. 'I am not prepared,' says Dr. J. D. JONES, 'to assert that Jesus was omniscient in the common understanding of the word. When He laid His Godhead by "He emptied Himself," Paul says. He placed voluntary limitations upon Himself. He laid aside this and the other Divine prerogative. And amongst other things He laid aside the Divine omniscience.' And some distinguish between foreknowledge and foreordaining. But for the most part men pass the matter by, content, with Dr. John KER, to say that our Lord acted by Judas as He did by all the rest: 'He accepted him on the ground of a profession which was consistent as far as human eye could see.'

It is no doubt more difficult to understand why Christ called or accepted Judas than to understand why Judas came. Yet the latter difficulty has produced a far greater variety of solutions. On the whole the modern solution is that his motives were good. Dr. J. H. MOULTON speaks of him as 'a young and patriotic Jew, his hands busy all the week with honourable toil, his heart full of a fervent and honourable ambition to see Messiah in His glory, and Jerusalem once more a praise in the earth.' And Dr. J. G. STEVENSON says: 'In all probability the personality of Judas was saturated with the Messianic spirit of his people; and, meeting the Christ, by a visitation of spiritual insight he recognized Him as the long-expected Messiah. Religion and patriotism would thereupon unite to impel him to join himself to the followers of Jesus; and when the call came to become a disciple of the Lord, he eagerly embraced the opportunity.'

If we are to accept this opinion we must turn with the more eagerness to see what mischief in the life it was that wrought his ruin. And this brings us to our second question. Why did he fall?

The old answer—and undoubtedly it seems to be the answer of the Gospels—was that Judas was a thief. But the modern mind will have no such simple explanation. In his clever but too independent life of Christ, written in 1901, Dr. W. J. DAWSON flatly contradicts the Gospels. That Judas was a thief, he says, rests only on the evidence of John, and it was natural that John, 'never himself conspicuous for charity,' should speak of Judas in the bitterest terms, for he was deeply penetrated by a horror of his crime. There is, of course, the undenied fact that he accepted money of the high priests. But Dr. SALMON of Dublin, who has a theory of his own, explains that the objection which we have to the acceptance of a bribe is quite a modern feeling. It is not very long, he reminds us, since British statesmen were pensioners of the French King. And it does not seem to him probable that the thirty pieces of silver had any other significance to the evangelists than that they were the fulfilment of prophecy.

Most of the recent writers on Judas, however, accept the love of money as one of his besetting sins. But only one. Another sin was ambition. Another jealousy. And all these evil tendencies, which were present in Judas as they are present in most of us, were fostered by the solitary life he lived. For nearly all the expositors lay emphasis on the fact that Judas Iscariot was the only Judæan among the Twelve. To Canon AINGER this is sufficient to account for the whole tragedy. Judas was probably of a somewhat sullen disposition at the beginning. A company of fellow-Jews might

have taken him out of himself. But all the rest were Galilæans, he alone was a Judæan. He had the southern contempt for the men of the north. That contempt passed into hatred as he saw them enjoy the favour of the Master from which he felt himself excluded. Then the love to Jesus which he really had at first passed into hate. 'The angel in him (and there must have been an angel once, telling him of his needs, his sins, and whispering of the beauty of holiness and the sweetness of reconciliation) had been driven out of him—and now Satan entered into him, and the end was near.'

But to most it seems that his solitariness only aggravated his feeling of disappointment. This sense of disappointment in Jesus is the explanation which almost everybody now offers for the betrayal. Judas had joined the company of the Apostles in the belief that Jesus was about to establish a Jewish kingdom of God on the earth. The rest of the Apostles believed this as well as he. But they allowed themselves to succumb to the spell of the Master. They came to love Jesus Himself. Their love for His person became more to them than the prospect of a place in His Kingdom. And when the disillusionment came they were followers still. Judas held aloof and allowed the love of self to master him. 'It was not long,' says Dr. MOULTON, 'before he began to suspect that this kingdom was very much in the clouds. Suspicion may well have turned into certainty at that memorable Passover time, a year before the end, when the five thousand excited Galilæans tried to force the crown upon the Wonder-worker, and He had to use all His authority to send away followers who would only try to baffle a refusal very unlike that of Julius Cæsar. From that day the great Prophet's popularity markedly declined, and it is noteworthy that St. John, who narrates the discourse which finished the offence given by the refusal of the crown, gives us here the words of Jesus as He declares that one of the Twelve is a devil already. Judas's heart had become more and more fixed on the earthly glories of his ambition, and he now knew himself deceived. The revelation soured the milk of human kindness within him, and he began to be fitted for the devil's hand.'

But the most startling difference between the old and the new estimates of Judas is in respect of his end. Which brings us to our third and last question. What was his end?

Again, how simple the old view was, and how conclusive. 'He went to his own place.' Did any one doubt where that place was? 'In the vision of Hell, the poet Dante, after traversing the circles of the universe of woe, in which each separate kind of wickedness receives its peculiar punishment, arrives at last, in the company of his guide, at the nethermost circle of all, in the very bottom of the pit, where the worst of all sinners and the basest of all sins are undergoing retribution. It is a lake not of fire but of ice, beneath whose transparent surface are visible, fixed in painful postures, the figures of those who have betrayed their benefactors; because this, in Dante's estimation, is the worst of sins. In the midst of them stands out, vast and hideous, "the emperor who sways the realm of woe"—Satan himself; for this was the crime which lost him Paradise. And the next most conspicuous figure is Judas Iscariot. He is in the mouth of Satan, being champed and torn by his teeth as in a ponderous engine.'

And that was the belief of all mankind till recently. Is it the belief of any one now?

Bishop LIGHTFOOT says: 'The veil is drawn over his fate. We dare not, cannot lift it.' But Bishop LIGHTFOOT wrote five-and-twenty years ago. In a volume of sermons by the Rev. J. M. E. Ross there is a study of the word 'waste.' Three texts are taken. 'To what purpose is this waste?' (Mt 26^{8}); 'Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost' (Jn 6^{12}); 'The son of perdition' (Jn 17^{12}). It is the same Greek word that is used in all the phrases.

So Judas is 'the son of waste.' What does

that mean? It means that he has squandered his life. He had his opportunity as the others had. They used theirs, he lost his. And the irony of it is that *he* is called the 'son of waste' who spoke loftily of the waste of the ointment which Mary spent upon her Lord. Jesus who accepted Mary's gift, hated waste. 'Gather up the fragments,' He said, 'that nothing be lost.' Most of all He hated the waste of opportunity, the waste of a human life. It is better for a man who throws away his life that he had never been born.

For life, with all it yields of joy and woe,
And hope and fear, . . .
Is just our chance o' the prize of learning love,
How love might be, hath been indeed, and is;
And that we hold thenceforth to the uttermost
Such prize despite the envy of the world,
And, having gained truth, keep truth: that is all.

Take up the phrase again, 'The son of waste.' Mr. Ross explains the word 'waste.' Mr. RATTENBURY is attracted by the word 'son.' The son of perdition, he says, is *the lost child.* Jesus used the phrase in a cry to the Father. It was a cry of anguish over a lost child. 'Oh, the heart-break in it! There is a lost child. It is thus he thinks of Judas.' And then Mr. RATTENBURY recalls the passage in St. Matthew where Jesus speaks of lost sheep and little children alike as 'little ones.' 'And the angel of the lost sheep,' he says, 'is the angel of the little child, eternally young and beautiful in the presence of God.'

Of all the places which St. Paul attempted to win for Christ, the place with the most evil reputation was the island of Crete. 'Crete,' says a recent writer, 'took no part in the national struggle with Persia; became proverbial for its internal quarrels; and in Hellenistic times was a dangerous nest of adventurers and pirates, with an important Jewish colony.' Yet St. Paul sent Titus there, Titus, whom he fondly calls 'mine own son after the common faith.' For the grace of God, he explained, hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men. Even the Cretans could be instructed to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. And 'for this purpose' the Apostle sent Titus there.

Would St. Paul have sent Titus 'for this purpose' to the island called Britain? If he might have sent him once, would he send him now? The conversion of Crete did not depend on Titus. It depended on the power of the Gospel he carried. Is the Gospel capable of instructing the inhabitants of Britain to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world? The question is constantly being asked. It is constantly being answered with an emphatic No. Dr. F. G. PEABODY asks it in his recent book on *The Christian Life in the Modern World* (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). He does not say that the Gospel cannot instruct us to live soberly, righteously, and godly. But he says that it is not instructing us. And the reason is that we do not understand the Gospel.

We do not understand the Gospel, he says, when we take all that the evangelists report as the Gospel. They report a good deal about an early end of the world. Professor PEABODY does not believe that our Lord predicted an early end of the world. 'The habitual attitude of Jesus in the presence of the great problems of experience has a serenity, assurance, and sympathy far removed from the excited anticipations of abrupt and final change.' The evangelists misunderstood. And Matthew ARNOLD'S dictum, 'Jesus above the heads of His reporters,' is to Dr. PEABODY also 'a wise canon of New Testament criticism.'

But not only did His reporters misunderstand him, we too misunderstand Him. We misunderstand Him more seriously than they did. We 'confuse Oriental imagery with universal principles.' We 'single out a teaching of non-resistance as the core of the Gospels.' We 'retreat from social obligations in the name of one who gladly shared them and was called a friend of wine-

bibbers and publicans.' All this, 'however heroic it may be, is not only an impracticable discipleship, but a historical perversion. It mistakes the occasionalism of the Gospels for universalism. It pictures Jesus as posing before the glass of the future, proclaiming in every utterance a universal law, when in fact he is primarily concerned with the individual case immediately before him, and is applying universal laws to the interpretation and redemption of that single life.'

More than all that, we misunderstand Christ when we take the Gospels as they have been handed down to us and try to apply them to our modern life. The Sermon on the Mount and all the rest of the contents of the Gospels as they stand were intended, says Dr. PEABODY, to apply to the Jews, not to us; to Palestine, not to Great Britain; to the first century, not to the twentieth. When we attempt to apply them as they stand to our own modern life we are driven either to the absurdity of Tolstoi dying at a wayside station with twenty reporters looking on, or to the greater absurdity of a Bradley declaring, 'None of us are Christians, and we all know, no matter what we say, that we ought not to be.'

The Gospels *as they stand.* Because the Gospels have been handed down to us with the utmost care, as if everything depended upon our having the very words which Jesus uttered, or at least an exact translation of them. But 'true Christianity' —Professor PEABODY quotes with great approval from Edward CAIRD—'is not something which was published in Palestine and which has been handed down by a dead tradition ever since; it is a living and growing spirit, that learns the lesson of history, and is ever manifesting new powers and leading on to new truths.'

There are two words which express the Gospel as available for us to-day. One belongs to the Synoptists, the other to the Fourth Gospel. The Synoptic word is Power. 'The multitudes glorified God which had given such power unto men'; 'His word was with power'; 'Until ye be endued with power from on high'; 'Till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.' The word of the Fourth Gospel is Life. 'I am the bread of life'; 'In him was life, and the life was the light of men'; 'He that believeth not the Son shall not see life'; 'Ye will not come to me that ye might have life'; 'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life'; 'I am come that they might have life.'

Now Power and Life are not words of opinion or definition; they are words of expansion, vitality, momentum, growth. They are symbols, not of a standing, but of a moving faith. Power is generated to be applied. Life is given to be transmitted. And how can power be generated and life transmitted? Not by a theology, but by a person. Not by the acceptance of a creed, but by the acceptance of a Saviour.

Then, the moment we understand that Christianity is love to the Lord Jesus Christ, we know whether we are Christians or not. And if we are not Christians we know why. We see also that such a Christianity is of universal application. That which was good for Palestine in the first century is equally good for Great Britain or America in the twentieth. For love is of no restriction. It laughs at locksmiths. And love to Christ will instruct any man to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.

If St. John wrote the Fourth Gospel, the three Epistles which go by his name, and the Apocalypse —the supposition is enough to take some men's breath away, but if it is granted, then we may say that he wrote the Gospel to tell us what Jesus did in the past, the Epistles to tell us what He was doing in the present, in the very time when St. John was writing, and the Apocalypse to tell us what He would do in the ages to come. For St. John, as surely as St. Luke, looked upon the progress of the Kingdom as the direct work of the risen Redeemer.

Now it seems easy for St. John to tell us in his Gospel what Jesus did when He was upon the earth. He had been with Him; he wrote of the things which he had seen and heard. It seems easy for him to tell us what Jesus was doing in St. John's own day, for he saw all round him the manifest tokens of His presence and activity. But how could he tell us what Jesus would accomplish in the ages to come? No one will claim that by the Apostle John the gift of prediction, if it ever existed in Israel, was recovered. He predicted the future because he believed in Christ. He knew what Christ had done, he knew what He was doing, he knew Christ Himself, and he was able to tell us what He would do. He did not know all the details of the coming of the Kingdom, but he knew that the Kingdom would come, and he could foretell some of the manifestations of it.

One of these manifestations was the gift of song. He looked down the centuries; he saw the children of God gathered for worship; he saw them, one here, one there, going about their daily work; he recognized the love of Christ that possessed them; and he heard them singing. Not in one generation only, in every generation, as he listened he heard them singing, 'And they sing as it were a new song' (Rev 14^3).

Is there anything that is more characteristic of the congregations of Christian worshippers than this? Is there any way in which the lover of the Lord Jesus Christ gives expression to his love more naturally? It may be song that finds expression in sound, and it may not; it is song that is sung in the heart. Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard are sweeter. St. John was a very true prophet. Whatever else he saw or heard—and no doubt he has puzzled us a little with some of his visions—this he saw clearly and truly.

Let us consider this matter of singing. Let us notice three things about it. First, that there are songs which we cease to sing. Next, that there are songs which we sing in a new way. And then, that we learn to sing new songs.

There are songs which we cease to sing. 'Jesus loves me; this I know, for the Bible tells me so.' We cease to sing that song. There comes a day when we have had so unmistakable an experience of the love of Christ in our life that external testimony, even the testimony of the Bible, is superseded. As the people of Sychar said to the woman of Samaria, 'Now we believe, not because of thy speaking; for we have heard for ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world.'

'Pour out the Rhine wine'—we cease to sing that song. We sang it in our irresponsible youth, and sang it lustily. Then there entered into our home or into our dear friend's home the degradation of a drunken man or the still greater degradation of a drunken woman. Or even if we have been so blest as to escape the pollution closely, we have had our eyes opened to the sin and the danger of the nation. And we cease to sing that song. The pity of it that even in such a time as this, and with such an example as our good king's, there are with us those who name the name of Christ and have not yet ceased to sing that song.

In the next place we sing some songs in a new way. 'I lay my sins on Jesus, the spotless Lamb of God; He bears them all, and frees us from the accursed load.' We sing that song as children and sing it lightly. Then we discover that we have committed sin. We see it in the light of God's holiness; we set it in the wonder of Christ's sacrifice. We recognize the burden of it, and the relief which the cross brings. 'I lay my sins on Jesus'—we sing that song in a new way.

'Nearer, my God, to Thee, nearer to Thee! even though it be a cross that raiseth me.' There is no song more easily sung than that before the cross comes; there is none that demands more of us

when the cross has to be carried. 'Nearer, my God, to Thee'—surely, but it cannot be but by a cross. He who went forth carrying His cross had to put it upon Simon. He puts it upon every one of us in turn. We are crucified with Christ that we may live. For if we do not die to sin, how can we live unto righteousness? 'Nearer, my God, to Thee'—it is the craving of every man who knows that he has been ransomed with the precious blood; but it is madness to seek fellowship in the glory without fellowship in the sufferings. When the cross comes; when it is felt as a cross; when we recognize that it is to be with us to the end, then we sing this song in a new way.

'Rock of Ages, cleft for me'—
Thoughtlessly the maiden sung;
Fell the words unconsciously
From her girlish, gleeful tongue;
Sang as little children sing,
Sang as sing the birds in June,
Fell the words like light leaves down
On the current of the tune—
'Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee.'

'Rock of Ages, cleft for me,'—
'Twas a woman sang them now,
Pleadingly and prayerfully—
Every word her heart did know.
Rose the song as storm-tossed bird
Beats with weary wing the air,
Every note with sorrow stirred,
Every syllable a prayer.
'Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee.'

Then we learn to sing some new songs. Perhaps it is strictly accurate to say that we learn to sing one new song. But in the history of the world there have been three new songs sung, of one or other of which every song, if it is a true song, is only a variation.

First there is the Song of Creation—'when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy' (Job 38^{7}). Next there is the Song of Incarnation—'and suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased' (Lk $2^{13.14}$). Finally, there is the Song of Redemption—'and they sing as it were a new song' (Rev 14^{3}).

Now all these songs are songs of triumph. They are sung after victory. Some opposition has been overcome; some great deed has been done; something of worth has been accomplished, something that was not easy to accomplish.

It is so with the Song of Creation. In the Hebrew history of creation the obstacles that had to be overcome, and the fierceness of the struggle, have been allowed to fall away. Nothing could seem easier than creation at the word of God. 'And God said, Let there be light, and there was light.' But the fact that creation was possible only after a struggle is evident in the Babylonian narrative; it forms indeed the whole spirit and motive of it. And it may be that that long process of evolution, which is the form in which creation is presented to the modern mind, evolution with all its struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, is but a return to the first conception of creation, a recovery of the elements of conflict which made the Song of Creation the celebration of victory—the shout of them that triumph, the song of them that feast.

It is so also with the Song of Incarnation. We cannot tell what opposition had to be overcome before the Son of God could take flesh and dwell among us. We cannot believe that there was any lack of love or pity. But that there were obstacles we must perceive from the fact that sin was allowed to abound and for so long a time before the angel Gabriel was sent on his mission. We may be sure that the freedom of the will of man, that most mysterious of all the facts that lie

between us and God, had something to do with it. The abuse of that freedom made the Incarnation a necessity; was the delay due to the danger of a greater abuse, even the destruction of the freedom of man's will? We cannot tell. We only know that 'in the fulness of the time,' God sent forth His Son, made of a woman; and the song which the heavenly host sang was a song of triumph.

Finally, it is so of the Song of Redemption. And as the act of Redemption was accomplished on earth we have no difficulty in seeing what were the obstacles that had to be removed—what are the obstacles—and how surely the Song of Redemption is a Song of victory. 'And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth.'

But while each of the three songs is a song of victory, each of them owes its newness to the triumph of something newly discovered in God. The Song of Creation is the triumph of God's power. The Song of Incarnation is the triumph of God's love. The Song of Redemption is the triumph of that union of power and love in God for which even yet we have not devised a name.

It is the union of power and love. That is why St. John was able to hear the redeemed singing. That is the secret of his foresight. No one can foresee the triumph of power alone, even such power as issues in creation. It may be thwarted at any time by that very will which is part of itself. God made man upright, but he sought out many inventions. Nor can any one foretell the triumph of love, not even though God *so* loved the world as to give His only begotten son. For love unwedded to power is always open to the thorns and the nails. But because St. John saw that this love had by the Resurrection of Christ from the dead been united to the power of God, he had no fear for the future. He bent his ear, and heard the redeemed singing their song of triumph.

This is the new song. Have we realized its newness? Have we seen that there is now no limit to the exercise of the love of God because a way has been found for uniting it to His power? Have we seen that there is no obstacle that can stand in the way of His power because it is one with His loving sacrifice? We may not understand how it is that this divine and irresistible unity is to do its work. We may not know how it will comport itself in the presence of the will of man which is as free as formerly. But we know that every enemy shall be subdued to it.

The subjection is through sacrifice. The will of man must be given the opportunity of yielding itself. What we see in these days is that this sacrifice may be made in a moment. Our men go to the front in apparent indifference. With the most careless of them the indifference may be more apparent than real. We do not know what thoughts lie below the outward show. What we know is that the sacrifice may be made, or at least may express itself, in a moment—in the very bayonet charge perhaps. Then the triumph song is sung—not for a trench taken from the enemy, but for the soul of a British soldier gone home to God.

The Tragic Schism: Has it been Healed?

By the Rev. J. A. Robertson, M.A., Edinburgh.

It is the legitimate boast of the literature of to-day that never before have the intricacies of the human soul received so subtle and so thorough an investigation. None of the spiritual lights and shadows, none of the great emotions and crises of the soul are thought to have escaped its searching pen. Yet in the case of the experience of forgiveness literary analysis has largely failed. It has failed to understand, or fully to evaluate, the moral passion which true forgiveness demands of the forgiving heart. We have had many moving pictures of the passion of a soul repentant, but few of the passion of a soul forgiving. There is a pathos about the failure. Because we are human we understand something of what it means to repent. Because we are human we have seldom guessed what it costs to forgive. And this, in spite of the fact that the sincerity of a real repentance refuses to be satisfied with an unreal forgiveness—the cold forgiveness that has issued from a soul unshaken.

It is self-interest, pride, concern for personal dignity, self-esteem which make the business of forgiving most irksome to men. And the broken-hearted penitent has usually to be content with the human forgiveness that has meant the breaking with these things. Nevertheless this scarcely touches the central problem of forgiveness. Forgiveness is a summons to love. The moral energy and effort required in forgiving is the greatest drain that can be made upon the passion of love. And it is true love—love without fleck or stain of self—that understands this best. But perfect love exists only in the absolutely pure in heart;—in God. It is holiness—the very ground of love, the sense of the awful difference between right and wrong—which makes forgiveness God's most arduous task. Holiness cannot stoop to condone a violation of its life and law,—that would be to undo Creation's bands. And forgiveness is Holy Love somehow taking to do with sin.

Yet this task, which well-nigh exhausts the limits of Divine possibility, is precisely that which God cannot help doing. Self-sacrifice, the ideal goal of all human morality, must be the very inmost essence of all the Divine activity. And Forgiveness is the supreme opportunity for self-sacrifice. For Forgiveness is what heals the broken peace and concord of that society of souls which is to become the Kingdom of God. Holy Love alone can know the cost of this. But Holy Love does not count the cost. It *pays* the cost. It was in the breaking of a holy heart that God in Christ tasted death for every man.

I.

Modern literature has sometimes come within sight of this ultimate problem, usually, alas! to declare it insoluble. 'Yes, I forgive you,' a capable author makes one of his characters declare; 'but if I cared for you, forgiveness would be impossible.' Forgiveness, that is to say, is a transaction which indifference may find possible: for love it is impossible. But the forgiveness which the cold heart finds easy to offer is no forgiveness. Therefore real forgiveness is impossible.

The same result has been reached from another direction. A few years ago Mr. Bernard Shaw declared that he could not believe in a God who forgave. Nature, and the pitiless law of righteousness which pervades nature, seem utterly unforgiving. Forgiveness, he argued, must be meaningless to a perfect being.

There is an element of moral truth in both points of view. The forgiveness of the easy, genial, mild-mannered man whom we familiarly call 'a lump of good nature' is just about as unreal as the forgiveness of cold indifference. But love is not mere good nature, soft-heartedness. The glory of love lies in the moral fibres of truth, and trust, and loyalty out of which it is woven. Forgiveness cannot come lightly from injured love. Only an expenditure of moral passion, amounting sometimes to heart-break, can heal the broken moral fibres which are the strength of love. God is Love. It must cost Him an infinite agony to forgive.

Again, holiness is not cold impassive justice, it is not an impersonal pitiless natural law, it is not a stern and rigid Puritanism of character, harsh, uncompromising, and uncharitable in its judgments of men. But it is something more awesome still. It is Conscience: it is Justice throbbing with all the sensitiveness of personality.

It is the obverse side of Love. God is Holy Love. And therefore intercourse between the perfectly Pure Being and the soul that has done a repulsive deed can be restored only at a tremendous cost of moral passion.

An illustration will help to give point to the argument. Tennyson, in his 'Idylls of the King,' makes Prince Arthur come to see his faithless queen in the convent whither she has fled to hide herself. We see the wretched lady grovelling, 'with her face against the floor':

> There with her milk white arms and shadowy hair
> She made her face a darkness from the King:
> And in the darkness heard his armèd feet
> Pause by her; then came silence, then a voice,
> Monotonous and hollow like a Ghost's,
> Denouncing judgment.

On and on goes this cold sad purity recounting all the terrible consequences of the sin. And then we hear him say:

> 'Lo! I forgive thee, as Eternal God
> Forgives.'

But was it forgiveness? Apart altogether from the fact that the magnanimity is too conscious of itself to have any kinship with the Divine, was the king's deed a genuine forgiveness? Listen to him further speaking to his queen:

> 'I cannot touch thy lips, they are not mine,
> But Lancelot's: nay, they never were the King's.
> I cannot take thy hand; that too is flesh,
> And in the flesh thou hast sinn'd; and mine own flesh,
> Here looking down on thine polluted, cries
> "I loathe thee."'

Was that forgiveness? Is that how you conceive 'Eternal God forgives'? Yet, in its very failure we can catch a glimpse of the tragic import of a real forgiveness to Holy Love. All the agony of the offence must be suffered and borne in true forgiveness. And in order that we may have the full problem before us we must again remind ourselves that true repentance is an attempt to see our sin through the eyes of the holy injured God. Because of the stain and blur of sin that is impossible for the wrong-doer in his own strength alone. The question, therefore, is, Has God accomplished Forgiveness? Has God forgiven us with a forgiveness so wide and so deep that it can take our poor puny broken penitence up into itself, and make it perfect for us? Has God given us such an assurance of forgiveness, as contains in it the full and tragic avowal of the agony sin causes in His holy heart, and the unspeakably bitter confession, *for us*, of the infinite heinousness of sin? The answer is the Crucified Christ.

II.

We need not linger long over the false distinction sometimes drawn between the outward event and the moral significance of the event. We have not stated the *fact* until we have stated the spiritual content and implications of the fact. It is not just the wooden Cross on the hill Calvary, and the blood that dropped there from His mortal flesh, that constitutes God's forgiveness. The world has seen thousands of crucifixions. Some were mere malefactor's gibbets—the legal penalty of a crime. Some were the result of a sad mistake—a blind miscarriage of justice, exciting only pity. Some were tragic—a good man misunderstood, the clash of opposing rights, a loving heart impaled to save another. These evoke admiration for the heroism of the sufferer: there is only one Cross in all the world's history that constrains us to adoration and awe. Why? Because of the Person who was crucified. Not a criminal—it was the criminals who did the deed—but the one perfectly holy and loving Man. In Him all the love and holiness of God flowed out into human life without restriction and without alloy.

It is not merely to the death, but to the moral meaning of the life that ended thus, we have to look. And it is not we alone, who, now that it is past, see its significance: it is Christ Himself that *exhibited* its significance to us. The outward facts of the Passion are nothing apart from the significance He saw, and felt, and lived out in them; His dying nothing apart from His willing to die. Through the insight which belongs only to perfect purity and love, He alone in the world of men achieved an unbroken communion with God which shaped itself into the unique experience of Sonship. And He felt and responded to the urge and summons of this experience to bring the God He knew and realized within His own spirit down into the lives of men. He alone apprehended with every power and faculty of His being the supreme purpose of God in History. He alone could and did surrender His will in all its unblemished freedom and integrity to be the instrument through which the Divine Will could perfectly operate to that end—the end, namely, of lifting a kingdom of souls into perfect communion with

God. It was because He deliberately and in utter humility identified His life's work with that Purpose, as His vocation in a sinful world, that the Cross became for Him a moral and at the same time a Divine necessity. And the vicarious shame which laid its ever-deepening burden on His pure soul, the pity and bleeding compassion which filled His heart of love to overflowing, as He faced the misery of mankind, were really and actually at last within the limits of humanity the Agony of the Holy Love of God. This Passion of His was more; it was the completion of that Agony,—the necessary deed in Time, the climax in the forth-flowing energy of the Divine Forgiveness.

Gethsemane is therefore the key to the Cross. And it was Christ's response to the call of God in His soul—His deliberate dedication of Himself to the cause of Humanity for His Father's sake—that led inevitably to Gethsemane. And that solemn self-consecration was the first act of His ministry—the submitting to Baptism. *Christ's whole life was the Crucifixion.* Every event, every experience that came to Him was a thorn, or a nail, or a spear of human sin driven into His quivering, sinless soul. The Cross was scored on the very door by which He entered our humanity,—born, like a waif, beneath the thatch of an outhouse beside some cattle beasts. His whole life long He was impaled on the world's hate and shame. Ending at last in one awful hour of horror and darkness, it was simply the unfolding of what the touch of sin means to a being of perfect holiness and love. 'In the death of great men the completion of their lives often lies. . . . So it is in a yet deeper sense with the life of Jesus. . . . It was the culmination in a scene in which past, present, and future were gathered into one that was the truth of that life. Not in the mere temporal succession of the events, . . . but in action in which duration in time became of merely secondary importance, existed for (Him) and for us the culminating instant which became eternity.'[1]

III.

If we here recall an old controversy, it is only that we may use it to help in the unfolding of our argument. A generation or two ago this was the question that troubled religious thought: Is it merely we who need to be reconciled to God, or does God also need to be reconciled to us? In the ultra-Calvinistic view, it was God that needed to be reconciled to us. In its extreme form God appears as a kind of Moloch of well-nigh implacable wrath, requiring and demanding the butchery of a sacrifice of pure and spotless innocence, ere His thirst for vengeance could be slaked; holding His pitiless hand with reluctance from thrusting men down to the fires of hell, and only because His own Son spilt out His blood before Him, to pay down to the uttermost farthing all that His wrath demanded of the helpless sinner. It was this grotesque travesty of 'the mystery of Godliness' that George Macdonald preached against in all his books with such fiery and rebellious energy. The old grandmother, in one of his stories, prays to God that her laddie's soul might be saved from the everlasting fire: 'O God, I wad burn in hell for him masel' gin ye wad let him aff.' It is a touching picture of a heart that is almost Divine staggering blindly under the cruel weight of this iron dogma—that God's heart is an eternal wrath which only an infinite sacrifice will satisfy. God is not visible in the woman's *creed*: God is visible in her blinded heart that would burn to save a soul. The life of Religion has often been injured by the abstractions and distinctions of theology. And this is one of the saddest instances—the habit of thinking of God as a far-off, passive, severe, cold Justice; and of Christ as hanging on the Cross enduring the penalty for man's sin, offering a sacrifice to appease Divine Wrath, acting out a tragic spectacle to wring the heart of God into relenting. The one fact we must firmly grasp, and never let go, is that God is in the whole transaction from beginning to end. We might almost say that there are not three parties concerned, in this matter of Divine reconciliation. It is not Christ reconciling another, namely, God, to a third party, man. There are only two parties concerned in the transaction,—the holy and loving Father, *God in Christ*, reconciling *us*—to Himself. Altered to agree with that old and cruel view, the Golden Text would run: 'God so *hated* the world that the Son had to be killed,'—no! it is too horrible to go any further. All the Agony of God was there in the Sufferer on the Cross; 'God *so loved* the world.' It cost God as much to give as it cost Christ to die. Nay, it was God in Christ that tasted death for us.

Swung away to the opposite pole of thought,

[1] Haldane, *Pathway to Reality*.

the mind then asks, where was the need for this transcendent Agony? If it was only rebellious man that needed to be reconciled to the Eternal Heart of Holy Love, why did God not choose to offer His pardon to men, standing at an infinite distance? Why did God not simply declare His forgiveness, and leave the rest to man? It is just here that the view we have offered of the experience of forgiving comes to its own. To say that it is not God who needs to be reconciled to us, but only we who need to be reconciled to God, is to be labouring still within a false distinction. It is no doubt true that God, who is Holy Love, has ever maintained an unchanging attitude of reconciliation and forgiveness towards men. From the beginning of history He has been bending over the sinner, and saying, 'Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die?' But it was always wounded Love that uttered the cry. This eternal attitude of God's Spirit has ever cost Him infinite pain, agony, sacrifice. The sinner would never turn, would only ignore God's call, if he thought that God was just a great mass of mere good nature, whose one desire was to make everybody comfortable, and who simply doled out His effortless forgiveness, wherever He got the least opportunity, no matter though the Universe were reduced to a perfect chaos, where all trace of the difference between right and wrong was lost. The forgiveness of indifference and of mere good nature is no forgiveness. But surely that is not the reconciliation that exists for ever in idea and in longing in the heart of God. God's forgiveness is the attitude of a heart full of the most poignant and tragic moral perception; of One to whom every thread of the web of life and history, so terribly tangled by sin, is one shuddering mass of living pain; of One who knows and is ready to experience—blessed be His name! who *has* experienced—the full cost of spiritual Agony which the situation demands, in order that right may be done by it.

The Godhead is neither a mass of indifference, nor a mass of sentiment, nor a mass of cold, pitiless justice. The Divine Heart is Holy Love. He neither ignores sin, nor condones it, nor sentences it *ab extra*. He *bears* it. He judges men, only by bearing sin. Christ died for the difference between right and wrong. In Him God pronounced final judgment on sin by enduring the last extremity of its agony. Christ took that agony into His pure, kind heart in order that He might say to us, I am God's forgiveness to you. That is the only forgiveness that will satisfy my sinful heart. The crucified Christ is my assurance of reconciliation; He is the pledge of the Divine Condescension, the cost of the Divine Forgiveness, the certainty of Love's eternal agony. It is as though God's heart had broken over a lost world, and in that deed of history which culminated on Calvary, the veil were lifted for a little from off the face of the Infinite Sorrow, and sinful men were given an awesome glimpse at this eternal tragedy.

IV.

How does it all spell out into reconciliation for each of us? The passion of repentance and the passion of forgiveness that meet and mingle in the bitter-sweetness of a reconciliation are, it may with truth be said, not two experiences, but one. The more perfect the restoration, the more completely is all the spiritual commotion of pain and joy involved a single experience. Love has been defined as the heart finding itself in another. Repentance is just love finding itself in the reproach that speaks in the heart of the injured friend. Forgiveness is simply love finding itself in all the broken sorrow of the offender. These are not really two experiences but one, in the moment of reconciliation. The symbolical action of embracing is an attempt of flesh and blood to express, what we cannot well express in words, that there are no longer two estranged lives, at such a supreme moment, but that 'the two souls like two dew-drops have rushed into one.' It is in the unutterable depths of such an experience that there is at-one-ment. Christ is our Symbol in the healing of the tragic schism between the sinful soul and God. He is God's embrace of us. His Cross is the mystic meeting-place of the injured God and the offending human soul. The old word runs: 'To err is human, to forgive Divine.' We may be allowed to alter it slightly: 'To repent is human, to forgive Divine.' What we mean is that though repentance and forgiveness are the two sides of the one experience, yet when the matter is between man and God, repentance is only a finite and broken and far-off reflexion of what is experienced in forgiving. Forgiveness is the great Divine reality, in which alone all the agony of the offence is known, which alone contains in all its fulness the true sorrow for sin. Within God's forgiveness there is wrought out for

us everything that is lacking in our repentance; —nay, it is God's forgiveness which, in the first instance, makes us forgivable by making us repentant.

Thus, while Christ's Passion is the Holy God pronouncing judgment on, by bearing, sin, Christ's Passion is at the same time the sorrow of the sinner's confession, the perfect Amen (as Dr. M'Leod Campbell calls it) out of the heart of humanity to the reproach that speaks in God's injured Holy Love. Even as the hot tears of a mother over her wayward child, while they are a symbol of the cost she had to pay in the act of reconciliation, are a pathetic confession also—to her own love, but for her child's sake—of *his* sin. The case is not unknown, indeed, of mothers who, when the call came to them to forgive, actually responded to it with such passion and intensity, that they for the moment fancied it was they who had to *be forgiven*! So completely had their love set them in the room and stead of their child. The case of Pendennis and his mother comes to mind,—surely one of the most exquisite instances of reconciliation in secular literature.

'"Yes, my child, I have wronged you,—thank God,—I have wronged you! . . . Come away, Arthur,—not here. I want to ask my child to forgive me,—and—and my God to forgive me; and to bless you, and love you, my son." He led her, tottering, into the room and closed the door. . . . Ever after, ever after, the tender accents of that voice faltering sweetly at his ear,—the look of the sacred eyes, beaming with an affection unutterable,—the quiver of the fond lips, smiling mournfully,—were remembered by the young man. And at his best moments, and at his hours of trial and grief, and at his times of success or well-doing, the mother's face looked down upon him, and blessed him with its gaze of pity and purity, as he saw it in that night when she yet lingered with him; and when she seemed, ere she quite left him, an angel transfigured and glorified with love—for which love, as for the greatest of the bounties and wonders of God's provision for us, let us kneel and thank Our Father. . . . He told her the story, the mistake regarding which had caused her so much pain. . . . Never again would he wound his own honour or his mother's pure heart. . . . But she said it was she who had been proud and culpable, and she begged her dear boy's pardon. . . . As they were talking the clock struck nine, and she reminded him how, when he was a little boy, she used to go up to his bedroom at that hour, and hear him say, "Our Father." And once more, oh, once more, the young man fell down at his mother's knees and sobbed out the prayer which the Divine Tenderness uttered for us, and which has been echoed for twenty ages since by millions of sinful and humbled men. And as he spoke the last words of the supplication, the mother's head fell down on her boy's, and her arms closed round him, and together they repeated the words "for ever and ever," and "Amen."'

Yes, it is a strangely moving experience, to have gone to a person to ask pardon for some offence, and to have felt the unearthly shame and humiliation of being actually asked for forgiveness by the person we had wronged. Even in that pathetic illusion of love's blindness we get a hint of the inner mystery of the Divine Forgiveness. Such an experience is shot through with the lights and shadows of Eternity. It brings us to the foot of the Cross. Not that God's Spirit in Christ's Passion confesses *our* sin to *us*; but that, identifying Himself with humanity there, and bowing side by side with men within that transcendent all-enclosing glory of Truth and Holiness which is the very ground and condition of His own Love, and upon which the stability of the universe depends, He makes (to His own greater Self, as it were), for us, and with us, the great reconciling confession. We cannot repent as we ought to repent, and we know we cannot. But at Christ's Cross we are assured that God's Forgiveness contains everything that our poor, broken, and flickering heart-sorrow lacks. Is there any Sorrow like unto that Sorrow? All my penitence, all my confession, is there—all my defeated hope and inward shame, all my blighted purity and the sense of doom,—there in the heart of that agony of the Forgiveness of God. 'And the benefit of it we accept, as we accept a mother's prayers and tears, as something our selfishness has required, but which, henceforth, we trust our selfishness shall never shame.'

V.

Here, at the end, we find ourselves still standing on the shore of the ocean of the 'mystery of Godliness,' seeking only to read the message of the music of its falling waves. It *is* a mystery; but of light, not of darkness. It is simple with love's simplicity: it is exhaustless as love is exhaustless.

A child can begin to understand it; but the eyes of faith go searching out the length and breadth, the heights and depths of it, only to be blinded with excess of light.

Standing afar off the remorseful Peter beheld the Cross; and he wrote, long after, of 'the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, spotless—predestined even before the foundation of the world.' The sight convinced him that the agony which was unveiled there was an agony which slept in the breast of God before the beginning of time. And in the great vision of the consummation of human history, there is seen 'in the midst of the Throne . . . a Lamb . . . slain.' That vision is a reflexion of the mind of the beloved disciple who stood beneath the Cross.

Above, behind, and in the Cross of Calvary there is the Eternal Cross, sin's perpetual wound in the holy heart of God. Calvary was the completing, the filling full of the anguish in the experience of God forgiving. But the moaning undertone of the Divine Pain stretches through all the span of time, and out beyond it, both before and after. The dull ears of the human race, confused with the wandering sounds of earth, have seldom heard it. Once or twice has an echo been caught by some earnest listening soul, and written by the Spirit of God upon the sacred page. The impulse which prompted the immortal picture of the Suffering Servant was surely a heaving of the anguished breast of God. Then with the coming of Christ, and through the few short rushing years of the Saviour's ministry, 'swift up the sharp scale of sobs God's breast did lift,' till it ended in the mighty yearning sigh which broke upon the earth and made the Cross.

A poet has recently depicted the prayers of the nations, friend and foe alike, borne by the angel Sandalphon into the presence of God:

> 'With Thee, with Thee, Lord God of Sabaoth,
> It rests to answer both.
> Out of the obscene seas of slaughter hear,
> From East and West, one prayer:
> *O God, deliver Thy people. Let Thy sword*
> *Destroy our enemies, Lord.*'
>
> Then, on the cross of His creative pain,
> God bowed His head again.
> Then, East and West, over all seas and lands,
> Out-stretched His pierced Hands.
> Then, down in Hell they chuckled, 'West and East,
> Each holds one hand at least.'
> . . . . . .
> 'And yet,' Sandalphon whispered, 'men deny
> The Eternal Calvary.'

Literature.

THE GREAT CONDÉ.

Historical biography is either a hit or a miss. The biography of a contemporary may have elements of interest however badly it is written. But there is no excuse for a badly written biography of one who belongs to the past. It had better not be. There may be only one person who has the knowledge that is necessary to write a contemporary biography, and that person may be unqualified otherwise. A historical biography is the property of any one who takes the trouble to become master of the facts.

The Hon. Eveline Godley has written one of the best historical biographies that we have ever read. Its subject, *The Great Condé* (Murray; 15s. net), is not of absorbing interest at the present moment, and its 630 pages of unusually close type are not alluring to the eye. But the moment we begin to read we find ourselves taken hold of by an adept in this art. The fulness of detail is found to be the cause of the fascination. And, large as the book is, the reader will be very busy indeed and very strong-willed who will lay it down before he has finished it. Most assuredly this biographer has given us a biography that will live.

How is it that the Hon. Eveline Godley has obtained the military knowledge sufficient for the description of strategical movements and intricate battles so as to put to shame the ordinary military historian? Certain it is that we obtain not only a clear conception of the court of France and of the great Condé's own character, but also a minute and intimate knowledge of the battles and sieges and marches of the end of the Thirty Years' War and the other great campaigns in which Condé

was engaged. No doubt we are much occupied with these things at the present time, and the fact that the places are sometimes those which have become so familiar to us—Ypres, Arras, and the rest—gives the book an advantage. But this biographer has a gift that is independent of any such accidental aid.

Perhaps a short quotation may be ventured. It is taken from the beginning of the second part of the book, at the moment when, on the death of his father, Condé became the head of his House.

'To the Queen-Regent and her Ministers, Condé, entering upon his inheritance, seemed to stand like the angel of the Scriptures, having a drawn sword in his hand, stretched out over the city. War was his element; the moment he was withdrawn from active service abroad, his very existence became a danger to the State. To Mazarin, in particular, he was an object of acute personal fear and dislike. M. le Prince returned the dislike, with interest; but he feared Mazarin no more than he feared any other living being; and in that respect was ill-advised. Two superior powers he had owned; his father's, and that of a Bourbon King. Of these, the first had been withdrawn in the course of nature; while the second was in abeyance, so long as the Royal authority was represented by a foreign Regent and her favourite Minister. The idea that he, Condé, a Bourbon, and First Prince of the Blood, should be swayed by any regard for a low-born ecclesiastic, a man whom he knew to be, physically, a coward, appeared to him nothing short of preposterous. Yet if the long duel between them ended, after many years, in the Cardinal's victory, it was largely because the "Signor Giulio," as Parisians called him, had too much wisdom to despise his enemies. Condé, in military matters a genius, and on most points a man of more than average attainments, still fell a victim to that deadly intellectual anæsthetic, the Bourbon pride of race. He could never, like some of his later kinsfolk, be reduced by it to a state of positive dullness and apathy; but its effects on such a temperament as his were none the less apparent in an utter want of self-control, and a warped sense of proportion.

'Certain passages with his father and with Richelieu, to say nothing of his more recent dealings with Monsieur, show clearly enough that he was well able to rule his own spirit when he chose; and so long as he was in any sense a dependent, he used this power, from time to time, as a matter of policy. But with the death of the elder Prince even this superficial control vanishes. Condé, believing firmly that the present state of affairs made him answerable to no one, gave himself up more and more to the impulses of the moment; undermining his hold over himself, and also, just as surely, his power over others. Only his soldier's instinct remained untouched; stronger than any other influence, for good or evil, from within or without; at times a guide and a restraint, when all other principles had failed. In private and civil matters the weaker side of his nature came increasingly into play, passionate and unbalanced; acting on a highly-strung nervous system, which had been overtaxed from childhood. Mazarin noted it; and learned in time to spread his nets accordingly.

'Retz and La Rochefoucauld, observers as shrewd, though less hostile, were equally alive to the Prince's failings, and recorded them impartially. "All heroes," says the Coadjutor, "have their weak points; that of M. le Prince was a lack of order and discipline, in one of the finest intellects in the world." La Rochefoucauld is even more emphatic: "A genius like that of M. le Prince produces great virtues, but also great defects. He was incapable of moderation; and by the want of it he destroyed all those advantages which nature and good fortune had heaped upon him; yet if piety, justice, and steadfastness had been joined, in due proportion, to the personal valour, the courage in adversity, and the fine intellectual qualities which were to be observed in him, these same advantages would have won him a reputation more glorious than that of any great man in the past."'

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

This is not a biography. Dr. Abbott, though seventy-eight, is still with us, working hard and producing at least one large volume every year. The latest, and one of the largest, is the third section of his Fourfold Gospel, its special title being *The Proclamation of the New Kingdom* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 12s. 6d. net). It is an exposition of St. Mark's Gospel from 1^{16} to 3^{35}. But although that is all the ground it covers, such is Dr. Abbott's method that the volume contains more than five hundred pages.

That is Dr. Abbott's method, we say. Who would wish it altered? We may believe in its fundamental idea or not; in the results wrought out of the most minute and scholarly study of the Gospels we are bound to believe. We are not only bound to believe in the results, but we are sure to appropriate them. Every student of the Gospels will find Dr. Abbott at his hand in the future, and will have no hesitation in accepting the work that he has done once for all. The thoroughness of this commentary on St. Mark carries us back to the leisurely days of long ago. We wonder how it has been found possible in our own day. And our wonder only increases as we study it; for not a sentence has been written down that did not first cost research.

It may not be easy to make sermons out of these notes, not even out of the most extensive, like those on Authority or on the Eternal Sin. But if we took the trouble, how great and how fresh would the sermons be.

CROCE.

Benedetto Croce has an opportunity at present of becoming the most popular philosopher in Europe. Eucken is out of it. Bergson has been variously translated and overwritten. Troeltsch, the greatest of all, as some begin to think, is also inaccessible. But Croce is an Italian and therefore much of a *persona grata*. He writes clearly, modernly, connectedly. And he has been exceedingly fortunate in his one translator, Mr. Douglas Ainslie. Once we get over the idea of a great system of philosophy coming from Italy—for Vico has never been more than a name to us in spite of the late Professor Flint—we are likely to take Croce to our hearts and homes. And if he were to visit us now he would receive a better welcome than even Eucken received two years ago.

The latest of Croce's books to be translated is *What is Living and What is Dead of the Philosophy of Hegel* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). The book was issued in Italian in 1906, and contained a Hegelian bibliography as an appendix. That bibliography was afterwards omitted, and it is omitted from the English edition. Dr. Croce proposes to bring it up to date and republish it separately. In spite of its title the book is really an appreciation of the philosophy of Hegel, just such a critical appreciation as should furnish one with an introduction to that great but difficult writer. Says the translator, 'Hegel has at last found a critic and interpreter equal to the task. Croce has passed beyond and therefore been able to look back upon Hegel, to unravel the gorgeous yet tangled skein of his system, and supply to all future students the clue of Ariadne.'

How has Croce succeeded in turning Hegel's 'Himalayan severity and ruggedness' of style, his 'arid and difficult' system of philosophy, into 'profound yet pellucid clarity' of thought? It has been done by reading Hegel and recommending us to read him *as a poet*, 'that is without paying undue attention to the verbal form, the historical accident of what he says, but full attention to its poetic truth.' 'The cut-and-dried Hegel of the schools is thus to be avoided; and when with Croce's help we have scraped the lichen of his formulæ from the thought of Hegel, we find beneath it the true philosopher, the hater of all that is abstract and motionless, of the should-be that never is, of the ideal that is not real.'

TAUSSIG.

It seems only yesterday that we welcomed a great book on the *Principles of Economics* (Macmillan; 2 vols., 8s. 6d. net each), by F. W. Taussig, Professor of Economics in Harvard. A truly great book and easy to read, it has also proved to be a book for students. There is probably not a Chair of Economics in this country that fails to recommend it as the book on the whole subject which ought to be mastered. So already a new edition is demanded, and Professor Taussig has revised the book carefully for it. The chapter on banking in the United States has been entirely rewritten; as it now stands, it includes a description of the Federal Reserve Bank system and a consideration of the principles underlying the new legislation. The chapter on trusts and combinations has been largely re-written, with reference to the laws enacted in 1914. Considerable revision has been made in the chapter on workmen's insurance, calling attention to the noteworthy steps taken of late years in England and the United States. The chapters on taxation and especially on income taxes, and on some other topics, have been similarly brought to date.

PANCALISM.

The word Pancalism has not yet found its way into the dictionaries. It is the name which Professor J. Mark Baldwin of Baltimore has given to his system of philosophy. The name is taken from the phrase τὸ καλὸν πᾶν. It signifies that 'the universe of science is a cosmos, which is not only true but also beautiful, and in some sense good.'

Professor Baldwin is a philosopher. But he believes that philosophy can no longer live alone, it must assume to itself a helpmeet. That helpmeet is science. 'Science tells us what is true; that is science's prerogative: and whatever may be science's final word about nature, that word is in so far the truth of the matter. Philosophy then enters her question: How can such truth be also good, beautiful, livable?' To this question, then, Professor Baldwin gives his answer. 'While others say other things, and many others many other things, I say—using the liberty of this preface—It is good and true *because it is beautiful.* Nothing can be [finally] true without being beautiful, and nothing can be in any high sense good without being beautiful.'

The philosophy called Pancalism will be found expounded in a series of volumes entitled *Thought and Things; or, Genetic Logic.* The fourth and last volume stands by itself, and is issued by a different publisher from the other three. Its title is *Genetic Theory of Reality* (Putnam; 7s. 6d. net). It is dedicated 'to all those who find in Art the noblest instrument of the Spiritual Life.' That dedication is also a manifesto. It declares that while Pancalism depends for its material upon Science, it seeks its directive impulse in Art, and its final aim is the establishment of the Spiritual over all other theories of Life. It is true that Dr. Baldwin is a pluralist. But his pluralism is not a radical pluralism. It is only relative, 'one of the sort that allows at least the comprehension of the diversity of so-called realities in a larger unity of some sort, such as the unity of experience, or the unity of law.'

Most conspicuous of all, however, in the system is the place that is given to Art. How does Professor Baldwin bring Art into the service of philosophy and of religion? By means of the imagination. The value of the imagination, he holds, has been overlooked in recent philosophy. 'The determination of the intellectual factor necessary to bring feeling into its true rôle as an instrument of epistemology has been lacking. Feeling has been left at the level of impulse or passion, or carried over into the empty form of transcendent reason.

'What has been needed is the theory of imagination, considered as a function partaking of the nature of cognition and capable of informing the affective interest, while free also to embody it. And it is not feeling alone, but will also, that is to be brought into the synthesis of intuition. The imagination must also be the instrument of the ideals of the will. This began to be prepared for in the doctrine of the imagination of Aristotle and the Italian mystics, reappeared in the theories of art of the Renaissance, and was developed in the doctrines of the schema and of art of Kant.'

MACAULAY.

The great library edition of *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second* is completed by the issue of the sixth volume (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

Interesting as it is to turn over the pages and glance at the illustrations, it is only when we read the text that the real interest of the illustrations is felt. We opened this volume at the page on which begins the story of Sir John Fenwick, and were led to read that story to the end, discovering that the portraits which came into the narrative at the proper place gave it an entirely new atmosphere. We had formed our own idea of each person's physiognomy—Fenwick himself, Lady Mary, Mordaunt, and the rest,—and the discovery that the idea and the reality did not correspond compelled a reconsideration of the whole event and started new thoughts about every participator in it. Not that a portrait always gives a true conception of a man's personality. But whether it is true to his character or not, it is there, an obvious material fact, with force enough to induce rearrangement of ideas, and even an entirely new attitude to the history as a whole. That is what the introduction of portraits and other pictures into history is doing. The four-volume edition of Green's *Short History of the English People* is a very different book from the single volume we are fascinated by at first. Whether it gives us a truer idea of the history of the English people or not, it certainly gives us a different idea, and we must reckon with that.

The new volume of Macaulay contains six full page plates in colour and one hundred and thirteen other illustrations.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHANGE.

Bergson is not easily read in English. The translators have not always done their best. But even if Bergson had been better translated than he has been, it would still have been necessary for the sake of the multitude that some English author should bring the philosophy into an English atmosphere. That has been done by Mr. Wildon Carr. He has written a book which is as much his own as it is Bergson's. He has written it in excellent idiomatic English. He has made the fundamental principle of the philosophy of Bergson as clear to the ordinary reader as contemporary philosophy can ever be made.

Mr. Carr has called his book *The Philosophy of Change* (Macmillan; 6s. net). The title was suggested by Bergson himself. It is not a perfect title. Though it expresses the fact which Bergson claims as his great discovery, it suggests at the same time to the English reader that that fact is rather a superficial one. Now Bergson is never superficial. It is not easy, however, to find a better title. Let us take and use it; but let us beware of regarding Bergson's philosophy as a frivolous thing. Why is it called the Philosophy of Change? This is the reason: 'While science is demonstrating by direct and indirect experiment that there is no rest, but that all natural phenomena must be interpreted in terms of relative movement, in philosophy a new doctrine is maintaining that it is impossible to conceive movement to be derived from things, but things may be derived from movement. Movement is original, all else is derived. Bergson has stated this doctrine of original movement most clearly in *La Perception de Changement*, from which I will translate two passages. "Movement is the reality itself, and what we call rest (*immobilité*) is a certain state of things identical with or analogous to that which is produced when two trains are moving with the same velocity in the same direction on parallel rails; each train appears then to be stationary to the travellers seated in the other." And again: "There are changes, but there are not things that change; change does not need a support. There are movements, but there are not necessarily constant objects which are moved; movement does not imply something that is movable."'

A LECTURER.

Mr. Frank T. Bullen is certainly racy in his *Reminiscences* (Seeley; 10s. 6d. net), the last of his long list of books. He died just as the book was ready for publication. It is evident that the lecturer is born not made. No man could go through the ups and downs, or suffer what Shakespeare calls 'the whips and scorns,' of the lecturer's calling unless he were born to it. There are pleasures if you can appreciate them. There are pains which even Mr. Frank Bullen did not always appreciate.

He tells his story with joyful frankness. We should say his stories, for his story is a succession of anecdotes. And he tells them just as joyfully when he is the victim as when he is the victor. The anecdote which follows is entirely typical:

'It will be a little relief to get my mind off this business of foreign hotels to recall an experience which if it did not amuse me at the time certainly did both interest and amuse my one fellow-passenger. I booked first class, as I usually did in these days, from Huddersfield to Manchester, where I was due to lecture at the Athenæum at eight, but where I had no offer of hospitality. The train by which I travelled was timed to arrive in Manchester at about seven, ample time for me to find a hotel, change, get a meal, and arrive at the Athenæum by 7.50. But by some accident or stupidity I got into the wrong part of the train and after a long wait at Stalybridge I became disagreeably aware that something was wrong. Indeed, I was past the time I had reckoned on arriving at Manchester before we left Stalybridge, and the train was going very deliberately.

'At last I saw plainly that if I was going to get to my lecture in time it was all I should do, and turning to my sole fellow-passenger with whom, after the custom of Englishmen, I had not as yet exchanged a word, I said:

'"Excuse me, sir, but do you mind if I change my clothes? I am due to lecture at the Athenæum at eight, and I fear that I have made a mistake in the train."

'He replied instantly: "Go ahead, for this train isn't due in until 7.55. Don't mind me."

'I thanked him and began, but oh, just then the

train began to cut capers and my corresponding movements about that compartment must have been amazing. My fellow-passenger laughed himself ill, especially when, struggling into a "biled" shirt, I was hurled, with both my arms prisoned, from one side of the compartment to the other. Indeed, his merriment had little cessation, for similar evolutions took place as I got into my trousers, fastened my collar, and made my white bow. When at last I had finished and he lay utterly exhausted on the cushions, he gasped out:

'"Well, sir, I've never laughed so much in all my life and I'll come to hear you lecture, for I feel anxious to know how such a preparation will affect you. Besides, I need a sedative and I guess a lecture is the sort of thing to quiet the most edgy nerves."

'I nodded, smiling grimly at his awkward compliment, so typical of the north, and just then the train rolled into the station on time. Giving my bag to a porter and telling him to get me a cab, I bolted to the refreshment room, where I got a glass of port and snatched a couple of hard-boiled eggs. The hall couldn't have been many yards from the station for half the second egg was in my fingers and the other half in my mouth when we arrived there. And I am afraid I was still swallowing when I stood up and faced the audience.

'Of course the lecture went off all right, they always did somehow, but my greatest triumph that night was being met by my railway acquaintance, who lugged me off to his favourite hotel and insisted upon footing my bill, because, he said, I'd given him the jolliest half-day's entertainment he'd ever had in his days, and one that would serve him with experiences to tell at his club, etc., for the rest of his life.'

The Rev. W. M. Grant, M.A., who wrote so excellent a Text-book for Bible Classes on Genesis, has wisely been chosen to write a similar Text-book on Exodus and the books associated with it. The title is *The Founders of Israel* (Office of the United Free Church of Scotland; 6d.).

Mr. Grant has the necessary gifts for the writing of text-books. He is a scholar, acquainted with the work done before him and sensitive to the least addition made to our knowledge of the period. He is a preacher, aware of the necessity of making the Bible an instrument in the building of character. He is a teacher, alert and experienced. And he is a master of the English language. These gifts are all necessary to the highest success in the writing of such a book as this. For the day is for ever past in which the introductory books were the most abstruse of all books and the most unreliable. Every page of this excellent manual is instinct with life and reality. Let us quote a single passage:

The Song of the Sea.—The Deliverance from Egypt was celebrated in the Song of Moses, the first Te Deum in history and one of the finest of the Bible odes of victory.

> The Lord is my strength and my song
> And He is become my Salvation.

A chorus of women joined in the praises of the glad day, with Miriam 'the prophetess' at their head leading the refrain:

> Sing ye to the Lord for He hath triumphed gloriously,
> The horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea.

Though there are words and phrases in the Song that imply later additions, 'nothing else disturbs the impression that the vivid verses are the celebration of the scene by one who has witnessed it.'

Is it lawful to rejoice so exultingly as the Song does over a fallen enemy? Dr. Maclaren asks the question that has such an intense interest for us at this time,—'Does Christianity forbid us to rejoice when some mighty system of wrong and oppression, with its tools and accomplices, is cleared from off the face of the earth?' And the great preacher answers his own question,—'When the wicked perish, there is shouting.'

Yet, while we rejoice over a victory, we should have no 'hymns of hate.' In the *Odyssey*, Ulysses forbids his old nurse to exult over the dead bodies of enemies who were most justly slain. 'Within thine own heart rejoice, O nurse, and be still, for it is an unholy thing to boast over slain men.' The Jewish Rabbis have a beautiful legend, which shows the heart of chivalrous humanity that is found in the Hebrew religion. 'When the Egyptians were overthrown and drowned, the Angels of God were about to sing for joy. But God checked them, and said, "My creatures are lying drowned in the sea, and do ye desire to sing before Me?"' This is the nobler way. In time

of war, when unworthy passion is easily roused, though we praise God for victory, we should not, 'like lesser breeds without the law,' forget the humanity and generosity we owe in the presence of death.

In the Book of Revelation the Song of Moses is lifted up from earth and taken into the praises of the Upper Sanctuary. The Saints of God, standing on the shore of the new Life, sing 'The Song of Moses and the Song of the Lamb.' Thus the beautiful figure of the Psalmist is fulfilled:

Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.

The Schools Personal Service Association has brought itself into notice by the issue of a Handbook of Personal Service. The title of the book is *I Serve* (A. & C. Black; 1s. 4d.). The author is Mr. George H. Green. In a short preface the Hon. Mrs. Alfred Lyttelton commends the 'admirable little book' highly. 'The teaching is simple and simply expressed—the book is in itself a preface to wider reading and study—and it is also a guide to the right ways in which quickened impulses should be used.' Every teacher and every sensible parent will secure the book and approve of the recommendation.

The Rev. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A., has published a *Key to the Elements of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2s. net).

Dr. Alfred Plummer has written the volume on *The Gospel according to St. Mark* for the new issue of 'The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges' (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2s. net). He holds that it is undecided yet whether or not Mark used Q; but the hypothesis of an *Ur-Marcus* he emphatically rejects. In his notes he uses all the great books, but the ideas (as well as their expression) are his own. They are, as always, well considered and weighty. For fuller knowledge he refers at every point to the Dictionaries, most of all to the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.

Lord Rosebery is most himself in character-sketching. His address on *Dr. Chalmers* is a masterpiece. It may be had from Mr. David Douglas (6d. net).

At Drummond's Tract Depôt in Stirling there is published a batch of little books, including *Talks on Personal Testimony* (3d.), and *The Soldier's Text-Book* (3d.)—the latter fit to enter the pocket, any pocket, after it is full.

To say that *The Hope of the Kingdom of God*, by the Rev. George C. Walker, B.A. (Edgeley Press, Stockport), reminds us of a work with a similar title by Professor A. G. Hogg, is to say a good deal. But we can say more. Set it beside Professor Hogg's book and it will not suffer. Mr. Walker has read carefully, and it will repay any student to spend time on these Bible Study Notes.

Lady Dunboyne has published a small volume of *Essays for Girls* (Wells Gardner; 1s. 6d. net). Dedicating the volume to her granddaughters, she says: 'Years ago, before most of you were born, I wrote the following essays for the *Girls' Own Paper*. The Editor at the time kindly gave me leave to republish them, but instead of availing myself of his permission I put them away with other papers for which I had no use then, but for which I though I might have use in the dim future.' And the dim future has arrived. The essays are not above the average intellect, and they give good advice pleasantly. The topics are Reading, Indolence, Study, Calmness, Empire Day, and so on.

To Messrs. Kelly's 'Manuals for Christian Thinkers,' Professor W. F. Lofthouse has contributed a volume on *The Making of the Old Testament* (1s. net). The Old Testament is not Professor Lofthouse's special subject, but the Wesleyan professors are compelled, or it is their pleasure, to be conversant with the whole Bible, together with all the theology and ethics that flow from it. No Old Testament specialist could write a better book for the beginner than this, a clearer, saner, or more reliable book.

The Rev. Josiah Flew, Ph.D., does not think that the only men and women worth preaching about are contained in the Bible. In *Saints of Yesterday* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net) he has published a series of Addresses to Young Men and Women on the lives of men, some of whom are quite modern, like Henry Drummond, McLaren of Manchester, and Dr. Arthur Jackson of Manchuria. Others, as Wesley and St. Francis, are not so modern. But

all are of like passions such as we are, and they call us to love and duty almost as strongly as Joseph the son of Jacob, or Andrew the brother of Simon. Dr. Flew has a keen sense of what will appeal to youth ; and whatever he wishes to do he has words to do it with.

The Rev. W. Forbes Leith, S.J., has compiled a list of the names, writings, and public services of *Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland in the XVIth Century* (MacLehose ; 6s. net). His object is not purely, perhaps not primarily, scientific, but apologetic. He desires to show that the Reformation is not to be regarded simply as 'the creation of light to illuminate a previous period of darkness.' He admits that 'after years of anarchy and destructive wars, ignorant and unworthy men did find their way into the Church.' But 'that the ignorance of the Scottish clergy was either so crass or so general as some writers would have us believe is,' he says, 'contrary to all analogy, and may be proved to be unsupported by impartial and contemporary evidence.' We need not trouble with the apologetics. The facts are really well known and indisputable. What we welcome is the fine scholarly work of a bibliographical kind which the volume contains. So well has that been done that to the historian the book is of priceless worth. It is, moreover, a handsome volume, fully and expensively illustrated.

Under the title of *The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas* (Macmillan ; 6s. 6d. net), Professor A. C. McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, New York, has written a short history of those forms of religious life and thought which are most familiar to the present generation. The book will be very useful to the young. Those who have been at or near the beginning of such movements as Agnosticism will receive enjoyment. But for the rising generation the book will be full of instruction.

The topics which Professor McGiffert deals with are divided by him into two classes. Under 'Disintegration' he brings Pietism, The Enlightenment, Natural Science, and The Critical Philosophy. Under 'Reconstruction' he has a larger list : The Emancipation of Religion, The Rebirth of Speculation, The Rehabilitation of Faith, Agnosticism, Evolution, Divine Immanence, Ethical Theism, The Character of God, The Social Emphasis, and Religious Authority.

These topics are so handled that we see their individual worth and yet recognize their relation to one another. Nor does Dr. McGiffert draw a hard-and-fast line between *modern* religious ideas and ideas that are not so modern. It is one purpose of his book to show that, as Bergson would say, there is perpetual change, but that change is never abrupt or inconsequential.

The faith which St. Paul believed in was 'faith which worketh by love.' That kind of faith is brought before us, at work in the world, in a series of seven lectures delivered by Dean Hodges before the Lowell Institute, and now published in an attractive volume under the title of *Faith and Social Service* (Macmillan ; 5s. 6d. net).

What are the topics? They are : (1) The New Forces ; (2) Indifference ; (3) Doubt ; (4) Poverty ; (5) Labour ; (6) Moral Reform ; (7) The City ; and (8) The Divided Church. There is progress in the thought. The chapters are not independent. The book is a whole. We should say that it is better to read the book than it could have been to listen to the lectures, because you can read the book at a sitting and recognize the strength of it. There is little theory and much practice. Into all the pain and privation of poverty, for example, Dean Hodges carries his faith in Christ, not to say 'Depart in peace, be ye clothed and fed,' and not to clothe and feed indiscriminately, but to show what consideration and co-operation can do, and bid us do it. For the most part the style is quiet ; now and again it rises into passionate appeal.

The idea of Evolution has completely captured the popular mind in America. 'Evolution,' says Professor A. G. Keller of Yale, 'is the fashion, and to affect evolutionary terminology is one method of lending a pseudo-dignity to the trivial.' It is long since sociological subjects were subjected to its dominion. And now it is little surprising to receive a book, written by Professor Keller himself, on *Societal Evolution* (Macmillan ; 6s. 6d. net).

Unlike most of the writers who use evolutionary language, Professor Keller began by asking himself what Evolution means. He took the word, as so many do, as equivalent to Darwinism ; and he tells us that in order to obtain some clear conception of what that is, he went to the works of Darwin and of Darwin's interpreter Huxley, and read what he thinks very few people read now.

Having read Darwin and Huxley, Professor Keller 'came to the question as to the validity of extending Darwinism and its terminology to the life of human society. As to this matter, I have come to believe that the Darwinian factors of variation, selection, transmission, and adaptation are active in the life of societies as in that of organisms. Selection, for example, is none the less selection—not merely *like* natural selection in a vague way—because it is observed in another field and is seen there to act after another mode characteristic of that field.'

Accordingly we have in this book an application of all the Darwinian methods and of all the Darwinian terms to the relationship of man to man. The progress of social life is due, as the progress of organic life is due, to selection, transmission, adaptation, and the rest. And it cannot be denied that a good case is made out for the method. The book has the merits of carefulness in the choice of facts and the clearness almost of conviction in their arrangement. If its attitude is unfamiliar, that will only compel its conclusions to be more severely criticised; it will not disprove their validity. Sometimes the reading is a little difficult. This is not because the style is bad, it is due to the scarcity of illustrations. A concrete case here and there would greatly relieve the strain of a long course of reasoning.

Professor Theodore de Laguna of Bryn Mawr College has written an *Introduction to the Science of Ethics* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). It is his belief that the science of ethics is making progress as surely and as rapidly as any other science, and his secondary purpose is to record that progress. But his primary purpose is to introduce the student to the science. He has written a book that covers the whole ground, and with sufficient fulness to meet the demands of degree and all other examinations except the highest.

His book is divided into three parts. In the first part Professor de Laguna surveys the field of ethics in well-pruned but quite intelligible language, and in carefully printed paragraphs. In the second part he describes in chronological order the great classical schools, beginning with the Sophists and ending with the Hedonists. In the third part he discusses the Evolutionary Theory of Moral Values. Within this last part fall the results of recent study. The two parts which precede it give the necessary data for the history of ethics: this part sets the student down in the ethical world of his own day and shows him how present discussion is related to the past and what problems it is leaving for the future.

Being an American, Dr. de Laguna is of course an evolutionist. But evolution is no accident; not even a happy family of accidents. 'The contrast,' he says, 'between the ethics of to-day and that of the eighteenth century is, in fact, typical of the relations between our science and theirs. Men had not yet learned to think in evolutionistic terms. And so long as they were limited to a choice between eternity and immutability on the one hand, and capricious change on the other, they were generally right in choosing the former alternative. When, for example, it was suggested that once upon a time man went on all-fours, the sober science of 1750 could not do otherwise than reject the theory as ridiculous. The manner in which the head is joined to the body; the disproportionate length of the legs as compared with the arms; the structure of the feet and ankles; these and a host of other considerations made it reasonably certain that man had always been a biped. Shall we nevertheless say that this was a mistake? If we do, our judgment is a shallow one. It is true that in the dim geological past our ancestors were quadrupeds; and this the eighteenth century did not know. But the modification that has taken place has been no superficial change of habit, but a continuous and profound evolution of the human organism.'

A book for the young, on the Apocalypse, inspired by the work of Dr. J. A. Seiss, has been written by the lady who calls herself 'Aunt Kate.' Its title is *Heaven on Earth and How it will come* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net). With our experience of popular books on the Apocalypse making us extremely cautious, we have been much drawn to this book. Its leading thought is sound. John did desire to give us a heaven on earth; he did wish to tell us how it might come. The explanation of the details is a different matter. But there is no foolish extravagance here.

The Free Church Year Book for 1915 (Meyer; 2s. 6d. net) is, of course, much taken up with the War. Some of the best war sermons yet published are to be found in it. There is much thought

given to the first question of all—whether war is *ever* justifiable. But there are also many good papers on the effects of this war—its effect on temperance, on co-operation, and the like.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published (1) *The World War, and After*, by Mr. Alfred E. Knight (2s. net); (2) a new edition of *George Whitefield*, a short biography by Mr. J. R. Andrews (1s. 6d.); (3) *God Manifest*, by Mr. F. Orton-Smith, B.A. (1s. net); and the first volume (Genesis to Numbers) of an edition of *The Holy Bible* according to the Authorized Version, to be completed in eight volumes (1s. net).

So much has been done in the scientific study of sex during the last ten years that Dr. Havelock Ellis, in preparing his classical book on *Man and Woman* for a new edition, has found it necessary, even after omitting certain portions, to enlarge the book considerably. It now occupies 563 pages (Walter Scott; 6s. net). Yet, he says, 'notwithstanding all pioneering activity in the world of science and all practical activity in the world of affairs, we may rest assured that the outlook remains the same. Some years ago I came upon a remarkable book written nearly a century ago by the Vicomte J. A. de Ségur, *Les Femmes, leur Condition et leur Influence dans l'Ordre Social.* "The object of my work," he stated, "is to prove that the two sexes are equal though different; that there is complete compensation; and that if one sex seems to possess essential qualities that the other lacks, we cannot refuse to that other not less precious qualities which are peculiar to it." It was, expressed in almost identical words, the conclusion I had reached in the present book. It is a conclusion I hear to-day from voices that speak with authority on many sides. "Each sex," asserts the anatomist Professor Giuffrida-Ruggeri, "is perfectly adult in all its characters." "The equality of the sexes in the human species," remarks the anthropologist, Professor Manouvrier, in his latest discussion of the question, "may be regarded as an equivalence which involves equal duties as well as equal rights. But equality or equivalence by no means implies resemblance." The extravagances of a section of one sex may evoke counterbalancing extravagances in the other sex. The serenity of those whose vision is wide enough to embrace all the factors at work will remain undisturbed.'

Nothing proves more conclusively that 'life and immortality have been brought to light in Christ' than the fact that whenever Christ loses His authority over a man, that man begins to look round for proofs of immortality. Such a man is the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, minister of the Church of the Messiah, New York. Mr. Holmes looks upon Christ as a mere man, who knew no more about the other world than a good man may be expected to do, which is practically nothing. And so, under the title of *Is Death the End?* (Putnams; 6s. net), he writes a large book into which he gathers all the reasons that can be found in this life in favour of a life to come. The reasons are not convincing, of course. Every one of them could be met by a counter-reason. Even in their cumulation they are not convincing. And yet for the sake of those who 'stretch lame hands of faith' it is well to bring them forward. Mr. Holmes makes always a legitimate use of his materials. He is in earnest, and just because he is in earnest is he careful to press no proof further than it will carry.

The Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A., is an untiring student of the New Testament. Whatever else we read in *The Churchman*, we read his Notes on Passages. But he is not only a commentator, he is also an author. In beautiful language and in as beautiful a spirit he has written a book on *The Divine Master in Home Life* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d.). Beginning with the life of our Lord in 'His Father's Home' before He came into the world in flesh, he proceeds to tell us how He fared in 'His Mother's Home' in Nazareth. He then shows us His way in all the duties of the family and with all its inmates. The chapter on Christ and the Children gives him an opportunity which he has not missed. It is a book of utmost loyalty, without a suspicion of narrowness. How much might some of those who speak coldly of 'the historical Jesus' give to be able to feel and write about Him as this man does?

The Ven. Algernon Ward, M.A., Archdeacon of Egypt, has compressed his *Meditations on the Cardinal Virtues* into small bulk (S.P.C.K.; 6d.), but he has said memorable things. Every sentence is worth reading twice.

The Coming of the Kingdom of Christ to the

Roman Empire during the First Four Centuries is the long title of a short book by the Rev. W. C. Tuting, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net). It contains five popular lectures on the early progress of the Gospel. Good reasons are given for the progress.

It is evident from the contents of his new volume that Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce has been preaching plentifully on the War. The title tells us. It is *The Battle of the Lord* (Elliot Stock; 3s. net). The title of every sermon tells us. And Archdeacon Wilberforce is pursued by no fears that in engaging in this war we are not doing our Father's business. He is much less concerned, in truth, to vindicate the war than to send men to the front. He finds a recruiting text on every other page of the Bible.

Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., has issued the third edition of *A Short History of Freethought* (Watts; 2 vols., 10s. net). The word 'short' is relative. This 'Short History' now occupies over a thousand pages octavo. What would be the extent of a 'long' history of freethought? The new edition has had a fair amount of care bestowed upon it—as much, we are sure, as Mr. Robertson's political duties could spare—and an effort has been made, not quite successfully, to bring it up to date.

The book is not a history in the ordinary use of that word. It is rather an apologetic. Mr. Robertson is much too keen a 'rationalist' to write impartial history. His aim is to commend freethought. To him it is equivalent to true thought, and there is no other form of thought admissible. He is glad of the help of science in his battle with religion, but he has no intention of being simply scientific himself. He writes his *History of Freethought* with as conscious an ill-will to Christianity as Gibbon had, and with far more numerous opportunities of expressing it. The history of every movement should be written by a believer in it. But the believer should have the courage to doubt, if not its perfectability, at least its perfection.

It must be admitted that Mr. Robertson's apologetic gives him one advantage. He is not lost in the bog of speculation as to what freethought is. To him it is every movement of thought that is against religion. But that, again, is the greatest weakness of his book. The movements that have been directed against religion are so varied that they cannot be brought under one title. They are, indeed, in some cases more antagonistic to one another than to religion.

Mr. Robertson's apologetic object leads him to look for irreligion where it is not to be found. He gathers art as well as science into his net indiscriminately. One of the most amusing results is that he solemnly claims Shakespeare as a freethinker. Shakespeare has been claimed by all the trades and professions: we think he would have said some interesting things if he had foreseen Mr. Robertson.

As Troeltsch shows in his article in THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, the apologist for freethought has fallen upon evil days. As a system, as any combination of systems that can be brought under one name, it is a failure. In Troeltsch's words it is 'a shallow illusion now finally dispelled.'

Some men preach their sermons, and some men write them. Dr. John Hunter has always done both. A most attractive preacher, every sermon he publishes finds far more readers than can be crowded into church or chapel. His publishers have now re-issued two volumes at a cheap price—*God and Life* and *De Profundis Clamavi* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. net each).

The latest *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, is right good reading. The Library Notes and News with which it opens are both literature and philanthropy. They tell us what the Librarian has been doing on behalf of the destroyed library of Louvain. Then there is an article on that library by Dr. Léon van der Essen, the Louvain Professor of History, who has been attached for the present to the University of Chicago. A further article describes delightfully the steps which the John Rylands librarian is taking to reconstruct the Louvain library. But besides that, which is all very good, there are two special articles worth reading, one by Dr. Rendel Harris on 'The Origin of the Cult of Dionysos,' and one by Dr. Mingana on 'An important Old Turki Manuscript.'

'The Lord of Hosts.'

By M. Gaster, Ph.D., Chief Rabbi, Spanish and Portuguese Congregations, London.

'The Lord of Hosts,'—is this translation correct? This is not a new problem. It has been discussed from many points of view. There is a large literature on the subject, which is summed up best in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (*s.v.* 'Names,' § 123, col. 3328). But I venture to think that it has not been approached from that point of view in which I wish to present it. Is the tradition unanimous which sanctions this construction and the translation of the word 'Sabaoth' in this connexion, as an appellation in the meaning of 'Hosts'?

For a long time I have been struck by the appearance of 'Sabaoth' as a separate, definite name among the names of God in mystical conjurations and magical formulæ. Whatever one may think of these mystical speculations and peculiar vagaries of teachers of occult science, there cannot be any doubt that they have preserved to us some ancient traditions of an esoteric character.

I have come to this conclusion after a long investigation of these magical documents among Jews, Samaritans, and other sects. It is obvious that those who expected thaumaturgical results from their manipulations of the divine name would have taken care to use that name and every other divine name in complete accord with the tradition of such names. They would not use a mere attribute of God as a proper name. We do not find in any magical formulæ which contain lists of divine names any one among them such as 'merciful,' 'gracious,' etc. (Ex 34^6), used as if it were a name; on the contrary, we find regularly the name 'Sabaoth,' standing by itself and considered of equal value with such other names as El, Elohim, Adonāi, Shaddai, and even the Tetragrammaton. It is evident that to the authors of those ancient magical invocations and conjurations 'Sabaoth' did not mean 'the God *of hosts*,' but was taken as a name, quite independent of what its real meaning may originally have been. The Greek magical papyri abound in that name (*vide* Wessely, *Ephesia Grammata*, Wien, 1886 *passim*).

Of no less importance is the testimony of the Gnostic authors of Pistis Sophia, 'The Words of Jeu,' and of the anonymous treatises which have been published in German translation from the Koptic by C. Schmidt (*Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften*, Leipzig, 1905). Sabaoth the Great and the Small are recognized divine spirits, nay, in some instances they are called 'The Father of Jesus' (*vide* Index, *s.v.*). The Word is taken as a Name of God, a manifestation of God, and not as meaning a 'Host' or 'Hosts.' The original meaning of the word had already been lost, if it had ever been connected with it in the combination IHVH Sabaoth. No less clear is it that this word was considered equivalent with 'IHVH' from the 'Ialdabaoth' of the Gnostics, so prominent in the above-mentioned Gnostic texts (*vide* Index, *s.v.*). [This is the outcome of the combination: 'Yah-el-Sabaoth' the Ṣade of the original Hebrew was probably pronounced more like the Arabic ض differentiated in writing only by a dot and pronounced more like the Greek sibilant ʃ and then hardened into ض by people who could not pronounce the letter properly.] The rôle assigned to Ialdabaoth falls little short of that assigned to God Himself, and no attempt is made to see in it 'The God of hosts,' but only 'God Sabaoth.'

This has remained the unchanged form in all magical conjurations and amulets down to Agrippa, Faust's *Höllenzwang*, in the collection of such conjurations tolerated by the Catholic Church (*Thesaurus Exorcismorum Coloneæ*, 1626) there are numerous examples in which the name 'Sabaoth' figures along with the other well-known names of God, among them also 'Omega' and 'Alpha.'

The numerous 'Keys of Solomon' and the 'Sixth and Seventh Book of Moses,' and 'Great Grimoires,' etc., bring this tradition down to our days.

All throughout we find 'Sabaoth nomen Dei,' as the author of the *Thesaurus Exorcismorum*, p. 53, explains.

If we turn now to the Biblical Scriptures we find 'The Lord Sabaoth' twice mentioned in the N.T. (Ro 9^{29} and Ja 5^4). In both cases A.V. and R.V. leave the last word 'Sabaoth' untranslated, just as it is in the Greek, where it has not been translated into 'Host' or 'Hosts,' but has been retained in the original Hebrew form.

The authors of the Epistles thus show us that they also did not take this word to stand in any grammatical connexion with the preceding 'Lord,' and that it was, as it were, a peculiar name of God. As such it was not to be translated, but it was only to be transcribed into Greek letters.

It is surprising that in both cases the A.V. and R.V. translate 'The Lord *of* Sabaoth.' There is no apparent justification for such a construction.

If we turn now to the O.T. we shall be met by some remarkable facts concerning the use of this divine name.

Coming to the O.T., M. Lohr (*Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos*, Giessen, 1901, p. 38 ff.) has grouped together all the passages in which IHVH Sabaoth appears either only as I.S. or in combination with Elohim or Elohē, with and without the article. He has given also in parallel columns the version of the LXX.

We find that 'The Lord of Sabaoth' is not mentioned even *once* throughout the whole of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges. The first time these two words are mentioned is 1 S 1^{3}, then sporadically in the other historical books such as Kings and Chronicles. It is then used very frequently by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Malachi. In the other minor prophets it occurs in most of them sporadically, and even then in a modified form. So also out of the one hundred and fifty psalms the use of it is limited to six, and even then not in an unmixed form. It does not occur once in the other books of the Hagiographa, neither in Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, nor Job and Proverbs, nor in any of the five Scrolls (Ecclesiastes, Songs, Esther, Lamentations, and Ruth). But what is still more surprising is that it is not used once by the prophet Ezekiel. Surely there must be some reason for this very curious phenomenon. Why should it not have been used by the authors of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, and why should the prophet Ezekiel in contradistinction to all the other prophets avoid systematically using a phrase which occurs in the writings of Isaiah and Jeremiah scores of times? No satisfactory explanation has, as far as I am aware, yet been given. I can only advance a tentative one.

It is obvious that this change of name, which starts from the sanctuary in Shiloh, is mentioned for the first time in connexion therewith (1 S 1^{3}). It connotes a deliberate departure from another usage, and is a distinct cleavage between the nomenclature of the preceding books, and no doubt also with the preceding practice. It is henceforth associated very closely with the school of the prophets, and finds its votaries mostly, if not exclusively, among those to whom Jerusalem becomes the holy city, and the temple therein the sanctuary of the Lord.

The prophets and priests from the time of Samuel onward make regular use of it. If this phrase denotes a deliberate departure from another usage, then we must try to find a corresponding phrase in the other books for which this is a substitute. Now, in the first place, it must be pointed out that the word 'Sabaoth' is a plural form. It is probably intended to be a substitution for another word also in the plural. The word remains unchanged. No suffixes or prefixes are added, and, with but rare exceptions, not even the article. It is treated as a proper name, not as an attribute or appellation.

The counterpart to and parallel of Lord Sabaoth is Lord God or IHVH Elohim. Now it is a fact that this combination occurs very often in the Pentateuch, and the use of it dwindles down to rare occasions such as Is 2^{11} 7^{7}. It is not used in Samuel. In Kings it occurs once (2 K 19^{19}), and in Chronicles twice (1 Ch 17^{16} 28^{20}). Not one single time is the combination IHVH Elohim to be found in Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Hosea, and Amos. Occasionally we get a combination of Elohim and Sabaoth (Ps $80^{8.15}$); Am 4^{13} 5^{14} 15^{6} has Elohē Sabaoth. In these we may see the transition stage, for verily the form Sabaoth is intended by the prophets, who used it in conjunction with IHVH, to take the place of Elohim.

It is further to be noted that whilst Elohim is declined and suffixes are often added to it, the word Sabaoth, as already remarked, retains its rigid inflexibility throughout the Bible. Only when combined with Elohē in the stat. constr. in the three passages in which these two words appear thus combined, the article ה is added to Sabaoth: so Hos 12^{7}, Am 3^{13} 6^{14}, against which there are to be set down the other passages Am 4^{13} $5^{14.18.26}$ 6^{8}, where we have Elohē Saboath without the article. All this cannot be a mere accident. There must be a deeper reason for what I believe to be the substitution of Sabaoth for Elohim carried out so consistently by the great prophets Isaiah and

Jeremiah, and adhered to by Zechariah and Malachi. The form of the word Sabaoth is highly significant. Though in the plural form it corresponds entirely with the plural form of Elohim, none the less it is never felt as such. It was a technical term—a name—the grammatical form of which was entirely ignored.

Concerning the ancient versions the LXX show a difference of treatment. Whilst he who translates Isaiah merely transcribed the word, the translators of other books gave the Greek equivalent for 'Host.' We have here evidently two traditions, Jerome agreeing also with the latter, but the Targum never attempts to translate the word but retains it unchanged in its Hebrew form, and so does practically the Peshitta.

The teachers in the schools of the prophets must mark a certain advance in the attempt of eliminating from the notions connected with God anything which might lead the people to retain false ideas. They must have been anxious to remove everything that might become a 'stumbling-block before the blind.' They may have felt a difficulty arising out of the combination of the Ineffable Name IHVH, by which alone God was to be designated, with any Elohim, a title which could be applied indiscriminately to any heathen god.

The word 'Elohim' lends itself to a wide application. It was necessary to limit the application and so to circumscribe the name of God as to exclude any possible confusion between the Lord and the gods.

Of course such a change had to be made very gradually. It did not obtain at once general sanction, nor could it at once eliminate the popular use of Lord and Elohim. Hence the vacillation notable among some of the minor prophets and the occasional lapses in Isaiah and Jeremiah, although they adhere most rigorously to the phrase 'Lord Sabaoth.'

When we reach the time of the Exile, we find on the one side Zechariah and Malachi adhering also strictly to the use sanctioned by the greater prophets; but on the other hand, neither the authors of the Psalms countenance such use, nor what is no less important the prophet Ezekiel.

At that time the wave of idolatry had spent itself. There was no longer any fear that the people might turn to heathen gods to worship.

This prophet takes up an attitude totally unlike that of any other prophet. He goes much further. Not once does he use the phrase 'Lord Sabaoth,' and he also consistently avoids the other phrase 'Lord Elohim.'

Both Sabaoth and Elohim are eliminated, and their place is taken by another phrase in which the constituent parts have, so to say, been reversed. In order to come to some more definite result it is advisable to enlarge the scope of the investigation and not to limit it, as has hitherto been done, only to IHVH Sabaoth. Other names of God must be drawn within the sphere of research and comparison, especially the use of the name Adonāi, whose meaning is perfectly transparent and not open to any doubt or misunderstanding. The root *Adon* means simply 'master.' It is well known that this latter has become the equivalent in pronunciation for the Ineffable IHVH. This word Adonāi for the name of God is used in most of the books of the Bible. Though not frequent, it is not unknown in the Pentateuch, where it occurs six times.

Among the other books it occurs in Isaiah twenty-one times, and in Psalms no less than forty-four times, whilst curiously enough it never occurs in Jeremiah, but is found no less than thirteen times in Lamentations! This frequency in Psalms and Lamentations may be due to the use made of these portions of the Bible in the Jewish Liturgy and the desire of the scribes to avoid writing IHVH. In the combination, however, of Adonāi and IHVH, used almost exclusively by Ezekiel, one must recognize a further step in that change which started with the combination of Lord Sabaoth. It is noteworthy that the LXX do *not* translate here the Hebrew word, but transliterate Adonāi; and for IHVH, in spite of the Massoretic vocalization, they translate Kyrios as it is translated in the Bible. It is difficult as yet to suggest the real reason for such a change, but even the use of Sabaoth in conjunction with IHVH may have appeared to Ezekiel still open to some possible misconception, and he therefore eliminated it also from his prophecies and used only names such as would not allow any possible misconception. The remarkable collocation IHVH Adonāi in Hab 3^{19} may now be a help to settle the vexed question of the date of this prophecy. It is so much like the use of these elements by Ezekiel, though in a different order.

In this connexion it may not be uninteresting to note that the Samaritans have never used the

phrase IHVH Sabaoth in their whole liturgy. But it is significant that the only occasion on which I have found the Samaritans making use of that phrase is in the mystical phylactery which is now being published by me in the *Proceeds. Bibl. Archæology*, 1915, p. 96 ff. Thus far we have been able to trace a peculiar history in the use of this phrase.

It is not here the place to discuss the use in the Bible of every name applied to God. A detailed investigation may lead to some surprising results. The only question to be dealt with here is the name *Sabaoth*. It remains now to examine what is the meaning of this word and how it is to be translated, if translated at all. The answer depends to a great extent as to how IHVH Elohim is to be translated. It is, I submit, a complete misconception of the inner development when it is suggested (*vide* Gesenius, Brown, *s.v.* 'Sabaoth,' and *Encyclopædia Biblica*) that Sabaoth is the older, and Elohim the late name given to God. Equally wrong is the translation 'Lord of Hosts,' *i.e.* of the hosts of Israel, and the idea that it originated with the warlike operations of David. Real warlike operations with more important issues were those under Joshua for the conquest of Canaan, and under the Judges when the people were harassed from every side and had to fight for their existence, and yet 'Lord of Hosts' is never used in the books of Joshua and Judges. It can only be understood as a parallel expression to 'Elohim,' and as little as we can say 'The Lord of Elohim' so little can we say 'The Lord of Hosts.' We are just as little helped by knowing that 'Elah' means *God*, as by that of the word 'Saba' meaning *host*. In the plural form in which they are used with a 'singular' significance, they have lost their original meaning and have assumed a certain theological complexion. The intention in both cases has not been to intensify the single name *IHVH*, as has hitherto been universally accepted, by translating the words 'The Lord of Hosts' or 'The Lord God.' The object and aim of these additions to IHVH was to create a real apposition and to bring out clearly what IHVH was to signify. I have never been able to understand the translation, 'I am the Lord your God,' with which so many commandments in the Bible end. Nay, not even the first commandment in Ex 20^2. It means nothing new and conveys nothing of any specific character to justify the commandment just given, or to commend it strongly to the people. If the ending would be 'I am your God' alone it would apparently not alter the significance unless the combination of the two names is intended to convey a specific meaning. The matter is however quite different, when we translate, as I have done, 'I the Lord (IHVH) am your God.' Here we have a definite declaration. The people are told that above all the Elohim *IHVH* alone is *The God* of Israel, and it is because of that, that the commandments are to be strictly observed, for the Lord will certainly punish and requite. This is also the meaning of Ex 20^2, 'I the Lord (IHVH) am thy God, who has brought thee out,' etc., *none* other. This would explain why this verse is counted by the Jews as the *first* commandment. It establishes the divinity of IHVH, and v.^{3} follows then quite logically and consistently, 'Thou shalt have *none other* gods (Elohim) before me, only IHVH is *thy* God.' This explanation is still more supported by the great proclamation of the Jewish faith. A.V. and R.V. translate, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.' In my translation of the Hebrew Prayer Book I have rendered this verse, 'Here, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one,' for thereby not only the unity of the Lord is proclaimed, but also that the Lord alone is our God, and no other divinity under whatever other name it may go. This explanation can easily be supported by many instances in the Bible, *e.g.* 'thou mightest know that IHVH is the Elohim' (Dt 4^{35}). This is brought out very emphatically in the great scene on Mt. Carmel (1 K 18) which otherwise loses its point. The prophet Elijah chides the people and bids them decide whether the Lord (IHVH) is the God (Elohim), and the people then exclaimed twice, 'The Lord he is the God' (vv.$^{21.\ 37.\ 39}$). In the light of this interpretation a passage like that in Jer $16^{20.\ 21}$ receives a new interpretation.

These examples can easily be multiplied, proving that the real translation of IHVH Elohim is 'The Lord he is God,' He who is styled the *LORD* alone and none else. In IHVH is the collective unity of those powers expressed by Elohim. In precisely the same manner must the phrase IHVH Sabaoth be taken as meaning 'The Lord he is Sabaoth'; it is He who represents that collective unity of powers contained in the designation of Sabaoth. The people understood, no doubt, what it was that was meant by the plural 'Sabaoth,' just as well as they understood what was meant by the corresponding

plural 'Elohim.' This new name was made known to the people by the emphatic and often repeated declaration of the prophets who laid stress on it that the Lord Sabaoth is His name. So especially Isaiah and Jeremiah (Is 47^4 48^2 51^{15} 54^5, Jer 10^{16} 31^{35} 32^{18} 50^{34} 51^{19}). It is idle to speculate whether that meaning was a vague one or a definite one. It suffices to have shown that the word remained untranslated, that it was undeclined, and was treated as a proper name. It was certainly not meant to be taken 'as *hosts* in a concrete form either of Israelites or heavenly bodies which never occur in the Bible in this form.'

However poetical and suggestive the translation 'Lord of Hosts' may be—which would, moreover, limit the attributes of God and would make Him the Supreme War-Lord—that translation does not seem to correspond with the true meaning of the phrase IHVH Sabaoth. Whatever the original meaning may have been, it was lost when applied to God, when it became a stereotyped name, and just as little as one would think of translating IHVH Elohim the Lord of Gods, so little, do I submit, can we translate IHVH Sabaoth, The Lord of Hosts. It must be either The Lord (The) Host(s) if it is to be translated at all, or the Lord who is Sabaoth, or rather, following the unbroken tradition of the ages and the old versions—The Lord Sabaoth.

The Anointing of Jesus.

By Edward Grubb, M.A., Croydon.

Each of the four Gospels contains a story of the anointing of Jesus by a woman (Mt 26^{6-13}, Mk 14^{3-9}, Lk 7^{36-50}, Jn 12^{1-8}). The details have undergone considerable confusion, not only in the hands of commentators, but apparently in the actual narratives as we have them; and it may be worth while to try to disentangle them.

There appear to me to be two original narratives, referring to quite different events. The earlier is that of Lk 7^{36-50}, where a woman who is a sinner comes into the house of Simon, a Pharisee, while Jesus is reclining at a meal; and, bending over His feet, behind the couch, bedews them with her tears, wipes them with her hair, kisses them passionately, and anoints them with ointment from an 'alabastron' or phial. The latter is that of Mk 14^{3-9}, in which, in the house of Simon the leper at Bethany (two days before the final Passover, if v.[1] belongs to the story), an unnamed woman brings an 'alabastron' of ointment of 'pistic nard,' very costly, and, breaking the flask, pours it over the head of Jesus as He reclines at a meal. Some of the disciples are indignant at the waste of the precious ointment, but Jesus vehemently defends the woman's action.

The story in Matthew (26^{6-13}) is an almost exact reproduction of that in Mark, with slight compression and a few verbal additions.

In John the narrative is similar to that of Mark, but more names are given. The house in Bethany is the residence of Martha and Mary and Lazarus, and the woman is Mary. Only Judas Iscariot is stated to have objected to the waste of the ointment. The date is fixed at *six* days before the Passover instead of two, and Mary is said to have anointed the *feet* of Jesus, and to have wiped them with her hair. Nothing is said about a flask, but Mary is represented as using 'a pound' of the ointment. Here only are we told that 'the house was filled with the odour.'

There are, I think, indications that the names supplied by the Fourth Evangelist are trustworthy, though he does not enable us to identify the host, whom Mark calls Simon the leper. The actions of the two sisters are quite consistent with the indications of their characters contained in the brief passage Lk 10^{38-42}: 'Martha served,' while Mary the dreamer forgot everything but Jesus. But why she should anoint His *feet*, or wipe them with her hair, is hard to understand. Mark's statement, on the other hand, that she poured the ointment over His *head*, as a solemn act of devotion, is quite intelligible. I believe that the Fourth Evangelist has himself confused the two narratives, and has drawn the anointing of the

feet, and the wiping with the hair, from that which appears in Lk 7.

But, turning back to this story in Luke, it also, as it stands, is hardly convincing. The anointing seems quite needless. Jesus tells the Pharisee that he had given Him no water for His feet: if so, it would have been rather a sorry business to anoint dust-stained feet that had only been bedewed with tears and wiped with hair. Has not the anointing here come from Mark's story? and possibly also the name Simon?—though I would not lay any stress on this, since the name appears to have been a common one.

I suggest, then, that to disentangle the narratives we should strike out from Luke's story all mention of the anointing (including, of course, the words ascribed to Jesus in v.[46]); and that in John's story we should, with Mark, substitute 'head' for 'feet,' and eliminate the wiping with the hair. The two stories will then be separately consistent and intelligible. The only objection to this theory that I am aware of is that the precious ointment was an article that a respectable woman would not be likely to possess; but I cannot find evidence that this objection holds. Writing on Luke's narrative, Edersheim says:

'We know that perfumes were much sought after, and very largely in use. Some, such as true balsam, were worth double their weight in silver; others, like the spikenard (whether as juice or unguent, along with other ingredients), though not equally costly, were also "precious." We have evidence that perfumed oils—notably oil of roses, and of the iris plant, but chiefly the mixture known in antiquity as *foliatum*—were largely manufactured and used in Palestine. A flask with this perfume was worn by women round the neck, and hung down below the breast. So common was its use as to be allowed even on the Sabbath. This "flask," not always of glass, but of silver or gold, probably often also of alabaster, was used both to sweeten the breath and perfume the person. Hence it seems not unlikely that the *alabastron* which she brought was none other than the "flask of foliatum" so common among Jewish women.'[1]

There seems nothing here to exclude the idea that the flask of ointment would be just as likely to be in the possession of Mary of Bethany, who evidently belonged to a well-to-do family, as in that of a 'woman who was a sinner.' The theory I have indicated makes quite needless the rather revolting suggestion[2] that Mary of Bethany had herself been a 'sinner' in the technical sense; and it may be added that the common idea that the woman of Luke's narrative was Mary of Magdala is entirely without evidence to support it.

Finally, a few words may be allowed as to the spiritual significance of each of the narratives. That in Luke illustrates powerfully the unconscious influence of the personality of Jesus on the sinful people round about Him. He did not repel them, like one addressed by William Watson:

> But thou, thou passedst on,
> In whiteness clothed of dedicated days,
> Cold like a star; and me in alien ways
> Thou leftest, following life's chance lure, where shone
> The wandering gleam that beckons and betrays.

He drew to Him the publicans and sinners, and made them feel that God loved them. The light of His pure love shone into their dark hearts, quickening them to repentance and faith, arousing a loathing of their sin and a longing for forgiveness. The woman's tears, dropping on the feet of love, and her passionate kisses, outraged the proprieties of the Pharisee's house; but they expressed, as no words could do, the love of one who bitterly repented and had begun to learn the inward joy of forgiveness. She loved much because much was forgiven her, and received new life from the words, 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.'

The other story is of one who had drawn closer to Jesus in spiritual sympathy and understanding than any other of His friends, and who seems to have been the only one that was able in some measure to share His feelings as He trod the pathway to the Cross. On two occasions, when Mary's devotion to Him is criticised by others as sentimental and extravagant, He stands up for her (Lk 10[42], Mk 14[6-9]), in a way that might seem overdone had He not won from her the sympathetic insight into the soreness of His trouble that was denied Him by all the rest. 'She hath anointed my body aforehand for the burying': the words seem to imply not only that *Jesus* could see this significance in the outpouring of the precious ointment, but that Mary herself had in some dim way intended it to be so understood. She could not express her-

[1] *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. pp. 565, 566.

[2] Made, I believe, by David Smith in *The Days of His Flesh*, but I cannot verify the reference.

self in words, but she took this dumb means of showing that 'one heart at least would not faint or fail in devotion to the very end.'[1] She had understood her Master sufficiently to be able to face without flinching even the death He saw before Him. And so, 'Wherever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.'

[1] Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, p. 297.

In the Study.

Literature on Judas Iscariot.

Some notes will be found on another page dealing with the recent interpretation of the character and career of Judas Iscariot. It may be useful to supplement them here with a few particulars about the literature.

i. Whately and De Quincey.

Modern interpretation begins in this country with the sermon of Archbishop Whately and the essay of De Quincey. Both these writers were no doubt indebted to German speculation, as De Quincey confesses for his part. Whately's sermon seems to be earlier than De Quincey's essay. It was published in 1839, along with two other 'discourses,' as an addendum to a volume entitled *Essays on Some of the Dangers to Christian Faith which may arise from the Teaching or the Conduct of its Professors.* A third edition, revised, came out in 1857. De Quincey's essay is to be found in the eighth volume of Masson's (the best) edition of his works. Masson's footnote is: 'Published by De Quincey in 1857 in the seventh volume of his Collective Writings: where printed before, if anywhere, I have not been able to ascertain; neither has the American editor. The speculation which forms the substance of the essay had been previously broached not only by German theologians, as De Quincey informs his readers, but also, I believe, by Archbishop Whately, in one or other of his many writings.'

Whately's argument can be given in a few of his own words: 'Judas believed Jesus to be the promised Messiah, who was about to establish a splendid and powerful kingdom (an expectation which it is plain was entertained by *all* the Apostles); he must have expected that his Master, on being arrested and brought before the Jewish rulers, would be driven to assert his claim, by delivering himself miraculously from the power of his enemies; and would at once accept the temporal kingdom which the people were already eager (and would then have been doubly eager) to offer him.'

'Partaking then in these notions, it was natural for an ambitious and worldly man like Judas Iscariot, to expect that by putting his Master into the hands of his enemies, he should force him to make such a display of power as would at once lead to his being triumphantly seated on the throne of David, as a great and powerful prince. And he probably expected that he should himself be both pardoned and nobly rewarded, for having thus been the means, though in an unauthorized way, of raising his Master to that earthly splendour and dominion, which, to worldly men, is the greatest object of desire.'

De Quincey differs but slightly. He realizes, however, that this view is a thorough reversal of previous judgment, and opens his essay with the challenge: 'Everything connected with our ordinary conceptions of this man, of his real purposes, and of his scriptural doom, apparently is erroneous. Not one thing, but all things, must rank as false which traditionally we accept about him.' We can give the gist of his argument also in a few sentences of his own. 'Believing, as Judas did, and perhaps had reason to do, that Christ contemplated the establishment of a temporal kingdom—the restoration, in fact, of David's throne; believing also that all the conditions towards the realization of such a scheme met and centred in the person of Christ: what was it that, upon any solution intelligible to Judas, neutralized so grand a scheme of promise? Simply and obviously, to a man with the views of Judas, it was the character of Christ himself, sublimely over-gifted for purposes of speculation, but, like Shakspere's great creation of Prince Hamlet, not correspondingly endowed for the business of action and the clamorous emergencies of life. Indecision and doubt (such was the interpretation

of Judas) crept over the faculties of the Divine Man as often as he was summoned away from his own natural Sabbath of heavenly contemplation to the gross necessities of action. It became important, therefore, according to the views adopted by Judas, that his master should be *precipitated* into action by a force from without, and thrown into the centre of some popular movement, such as, once beginning to revolve, could not afterwards be suspended or checked. Christ must be *compromised* before doubts could have time to form.'

ii. Lives of Christ.

These speculations have had an extraordinary influence. Of the published sermons on the Traitor there are few indeed that are not affected by them. The influence, however, is not so visible in the Lives of Christ. Andrews' *Life of our Lord upon the Earth* (unapproachable as a student's guide to the events of the life of Christ), of which the revised edition was published in 1892, rejects altogether this explanation of Judas' treachery. It is not sufficient to account for it. If this was all that Judas wanted to do he could have accomplished it without taking the attitude of a traitor.

Bruce is very modern, but in his *Training of the Twelve* (1871) he takes a low view of the character of Judas. He was covetous and he was vindictive. He hated his fellow-disciples because they were Galilæans. He hated Jesus because He saw through him. At last he recognized that a catastrophe was at hand, and precipitated it to save his own skin. But Bruce is not content with his own explanation. The horror of the crime is too great for any explanation that can be offered. It is 'an incomprehensible mystery of iniquity.'

Dr. W. J. Dawson wrote a life of Christ (which he probably would not write now) and published it, in 1901, under the title of *The Man Christ Jesus*. He shows little of the influence of De Quincey or any one else. The relations of Judas with the rest of the disciples (until he revealed himself as the traitor) were quite cordial. He was no thief. He may have had 'a tendency to avarice,' which John afterwards exaggerated into a deliberate charge of theft. He had once wished that Jesus would head the national party. But Jesus had betrayed him. Betrayal deserved betrayal. The idea may recall De Quincey, but it is Dr. Dawson's own.

Edersheim is untouched by sentimental weakness for Judas and his fate. He is faithful to the written word. Judas had great natural capacity. It was his gift of administration that gave him the purse. But his gift became his temptation, as it so often does. Yet Edersheim is more impressed with the ambition than with the avarice of Judas. He joined Jesus to share the triumphs of the Jewish Messiah, with whom he identified Jesus from the beginning. But his ambition rested solely on selfishness, and when he saw that it was not to be realized he gave himself into the hands of the Jewish priests, who used him as their tool and then dismissed him.

It was Fairbairn, in his early book, *Studies in the Life of Christ* (1881), who gave popularity to the new conception of Judas as a disappointed patriot. Fairbairn was just sufficiently 'advanced' to be acceptable to young preachers. 'The remorse of Judas disproves his greed: the man who could feel it had too much latent nobility of soul to be an abject slave of avarice.' The fact that he was the bearer of the bag proves that he was no lover of money. Jesus would never have led him into such a temptation. Fairbairn will have none of De Quincey's notion that Judas was a guiltless enthusiast. When Jesus called him he was a possible Peter, but he was the only Judæan of the band (we shall be told that often again); while transforming love drew the rest one way, solitariness and selfishness sent him the other. Disappointed in Jesus, who would not set up the Messianic kingdom, he found revenge for his disappointment in betrayal.

After Fairbairn wrote the ordinary churchgoer began to hear that there was a possible Judas in his own pew.

Farrar is almost negligible. Both in the *Life of Christ* and in the much less familiar *Life of Lives* (1900), he follows closely the interpretation of the motives of Judas which the Gospels give. He thinks he was the son of Simon Zelotes, and inherited the disposition as well as the earthly hopes of the sect of the Zealots. But vulgar greed overthrew him. Farrar is really eloquent on one topic, the gradual hold that sin obtains on the sinner; and he is really heterodox on another, the hope that even Judas 'now sits at the feet of the Lord whom he betrayed on earth, clothed and in his right mind.'

Oscar Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, published in 1901, was translated into English and issued in this country in 1904. Holtzmann holds that we have

no materials out of which to construct the mind of Judas and we must take to guessing. 'That he was simply an avaricious man and betrayed Jesus for the mere sake of obtaining money for the deed is manifestly erroneous.' Such an idea is incredible, for he had left all and followed Jesus, and he had shared the wanderings and the roofless couch. He perceived that Jesus was gradually separating Himself from the rulers. His death was inevitable. Were they all to be involved in His ruin? The only way that Judas could discover of saving himself and his fellow-disciples was to hand Jesus over to the authorities, and he handed Him over. It was a case of what we call turning King's evidence —with the usual results.

iii. Sermons.

Let us take the Sermons in alphabetical order also, and begin with Canon Ainger.

Canon Ainger has a sermon on Judas in his posthumous volume, *The Gospel and Human Life* (1904). He first asks why Judas joined the apostolic band. He can only guess. But he is sure that Bunyan is wrong. 'Bunyan, you may remember, assumes boldly that he joined the party of Christ at first from interested motives. Speaking of those who (as he says) make "of religion a stalking horse, to get and enjoy the world," he goes on, "Judas the devil was also of this religion: he was religious for the bag, that he might be possessed of what was therein." And again, "so surely as Judas designed the world in becoming religious, so surely did he also sell religion and his Master for the same." But whatever the likelihood may be, there is no jot of evidence to show that Judas "designed the world"—that is to say, had worldly aims in view when he became religious.' We know him, up to the last great apostasy, 'only as an office-bearer.' He 'had a turn for figures.' His methodical habits made the others leave their simple finances in his hands. But a turn for figures sometimes goes with a mercenary temper, and Judas was a thief. Did thirty pieces tempt him then? Not alone. 'He suffered from loneliness, the loneliness of selfishness, the loneliness of

> A still salt pool, locked in with bars of sand,
> Left on the shore; that hears all night
> The plunging seas draw backward from the land
> Their moon-led waters white—'

He became discontented. Discontent was the ever-present reason, the bribe was the opportunity of the moment. And when the deed was done, what he awoke to was his isolation and the selfishness of it.

Bishop Boyd Carpenter in *The Son of Man among the Sons of Men* (1893) gives a résumé of Whately (whom he spells Whateley—fie! fie! and a bishop!), De Quincey, and Fairbairn, and then 'ventures to propound another theory.' This is the theory. Judas joined the company of Christ's followers from self-interest. Christ was a rising star. Conscious of his own ability to do well if he had the opportunity, Judas cast in his lot with Him, and was fortunate in being chosen as one of the Twelve, and exalted to the responsible post of treasurer. But Jesus did not retain His popularity. Had Judas made a mistake? It would be prudent in any case to be on good terms with the other side. Then, whatever happens, he is safe. He had no intention of abandoning Jesus even at the last. Even when he gave his Master the kiss he kept himself disconnected from the priestly party. For even then he was not sure that Jesus might not gain the upper hand. But with the kiss came the discovery. 'Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?' He returns to the city. He visits the priests in order to see that he is right with them, and perhaps to claim a greater reward. They treat him as the paid spy he is. He throws their money in their face and goes and hangs himself.

Dr. J. D. Jones includes Judas Iscariot in *The Glorious Company of the Apostles* (1904). His tragic end was due to a divided heart. His heart was divided between Christ and Mammon. 'I am going to take my stand on the plain word of Scripture, and maintain that what prompted him to this crime was *greed*.' And then follow some well-addressed lessons on sins against privilege, sins against warning, and sins that are often repeated.

Dr. John Ker, whose sermon on 'Judas and the Priests' is contained in the first volume of his published discourses, takes all the whitewashing off the figure of Judas and finds his sin to be simple selfishness. That led him into separation from human companionship and drove him to try to make friends with the chief priests. Rejected at last by them he found that his sin had separated his soul from God, and that there was nothing for

him but a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and consuming fire. Then Dr. Ker tells us what he thinks of the chief priests.

Liddon—the sermon on 'The Traitor-Apostle' is in *Passiontide Sermons*—Liddon is old-fashioned enough to be troubled with the thought that Judas may have been chosen simply and solely to fulfil Scripture. He disposes of that, by saying that the Bible is both Calvinistic and Arminian, and 'we must hold fast to each separately, in spite of the apparent contradiction.' Then he takes the career of Judas as illustrating 'the power of a single passion to enwrap, enchain, possess, degrade a man's whole character.' Judas had one vice or passion—the love of money.

In Lightfoot's *Sermons preached in St. Paul's Cathedral* there is a sermon on 'The Fate of Judas.' He also touches the theological difficulty. But he solves it on the earth. Judas 'was selected for the Apostleship, as we are called into Church membership. But, like us, he was allowed the exercise of his human free-will; he was not compelled by an irresistible fate to act unworthily of his calling; he was free to make his election between good and evil; he rejected the good, and he chose the evil.' Lightfoot finds the moral difficulty more troublesome. The difficulty is how Judas with all his privileges could do it. He had allowed one vile passion to grow unchecked in his heart. Like the evangelist, Lightfoot 'knows nothing of delicate modern phrases,' and calls the passion thieving. It is a long story, and perhaps it was a long struggle. Then the opportunity came and he fell.

One of the followers of the Fairbairn tradition is Dr. J. H. Moulton, but he has too keen a mind to follow it whole-heartedly. His sermon on Judas was published as long ago as 1898, in *Visions of Sin*. It is a sermon that awakens thought at every step. But the essentials are these. 'Judas started with the same earthly and political conception of the Kingdom of Heaven as did the other apostles. It was not long before he began to suspect that this kingdom was very much in the clouds. Jesus won the others body and soul, and made it impossible for them to conceive Him as anything less than a King. But the heart of Judas became more and more fixed on the earthly glories of his ambition, and he now knew himself deceived. The revelation soured the milk of human kindness within him, and he began to be fitted for the devil's hand.' 'The most awful lesson of the subsequent history is the manifestation of the infinite power of one single evil inclination. A once noble enthusiast has yielded to a worldly ambition, and we see that one evil, originally only the excess of an innocent and even admirable desire, spread like a cancer over the soul till every trace of nobleness and enthusiasm has gone.' 'Judas submitted with no shame to the washing of his feet by "the Master and the Lord," partook of the sacred bread which ever after would be taken by Christ's saints in remembrance of Him, received from the Master of the feast the portion of special honour, by which He strove, even at the last, to win him back, and then went out into the night and did his deed. If conscience still spoke to the miserable man, he no doubt stifled the accusing voice with the assertion that He whose power he knew so well would surely be able to save Himself. When that last excuse was shattered by the unresisted condemnation, all hell was let loose on the wretch as he knew what he had done. To the contemptuous cruel priests, to the holy place, so soon to be deserted for ever by the Presence that made it holy, to the field of blood he fled, and the ghastly corpse lay stark and still. He went to his own place, and his epitaph, spoken by One who alone has knowledge to pronounce on wasted lives, was, "Good were it for that man if he had not been born."'

Dr. George Salmon is 'not going to follow the example of some ingenious men who delight in reversing popular judgments; in picking holes in the characters of men whose lives have been the subject of popular admiration; and in showing that others who have been branded as villains have been unjustly condemned, and that even if they had actually committed the deeds laid to their charge, they had some virtuous or honourable motive.' Yet he begins his sermon on 'The Colour-Blindness of Judas' (*Cathedral and University Sermons*) by saying, 'I am persuaded that if Judas tried himself by his own standards he would not have thought himself a bad man. He had made a mistake in committing himself to a hopeless cause. That is no uncommon experience; and if Judas had been only a deserter and not a traitor, he might be defended by the example of many eminent men who, notwithstanding having changed sides in the course of their career, have died respected.' His fault lay in becoming a traitor. How did he become a traitor? He had

friends outside the circle of the disciples who told him that the Jewish government had fully determined on his Master's death. But they wished it done quietly for the sake of the disciples. If Judas would give them the opportunity, he would save not only himself but his companions also. And they kept their word. Jesus was arrested; His followers were allowed to go. No doubt Judas took money for the betrayal, but in that day it was no disgrace for a man, no disgrace for any man, to take a bribe.

There are other sermons, and some of them are good. A fuller list will be found in the forthcoming volume on *The Greater Men and Women of the Bible*. But these are the most representative. In closing this short survey, let us say that the best dictionary or encyclopædia article is the article by Professor J. G. Tasker in *The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

Colour in July.

'He hath made everything beautiful.'—Ec 3^{11}.

One wet Saturday I went into a cottage in a country town, and there I found two little girls who were very happy. They had a paint-box; furthermore, they had got permission to colour the prints in some old numbers of a children's magazine. What gorgeous pictures they were making! Bright blue skies, and fields gay beyond any I had ever seen. Then there were little girls who played in the fields; they had golden hair, and were dressed in colours that made one think of the rainbow. On that rainy day the hearts of those two children were happy, they were in a world of sunshine, for they had a paint-box, and were allowed to use it.

All boys and girls love colours to a certain extent. Even a baby will be attracted by an orange, not because she knows how it tastes, but there is something about its colour that makes her want to grasp it. I have spoken of the baby as 'she,' just because girls seem to show a greater preference for things of a bright colour than boys do. But even a boy, and one who loves sport, will occasionally feel something he has never felt before, when on a sunny July afternoon he notices the bright red streak made by a great many poppies growing together in a cornfield. If his sister be with him, he may not say much; perhaps he will only venture something like, 'Just look at that bright red line, Annie—poppies, I believe.' And you all know how a commonplace country road is beautified, if the grassy banks at each side of it are covered with wild roses. I have been with boys and girls when they carried home great bunches of them. We did not realize that much of the charm of the wild rose consists in its growing outside, and being one of many.

Then, I wonder if any of you boys or girls ever went out into the country for milk early in the morning. I remember one road that led to a dairy farm *very* well. A burn ran alongside of it, and its banks were covered with 'Queen of the Meadow.' I do not believe that the 'Queen of the Meadow' would by itself have attracted the little milk carriers, but in July 'Ragged Robin' grew beside it. As you know, it has a sort of pink shade, and there were 'ox-eyed daisies' in a field quite near. The girls used to go home, their sun-bonnets decorated with gay flowers, and even an occasional boy might be seen with a 'button-hole.' I used to wish with all my heart that I was one of the company.

Gardens are very beautiful in July; in them, however, you often get colour arranged after a particular plan. It is not so in the open country. Flowers, quite little in themselves, seem to grow in patches; they startle and delight us with an unexpected line of colour, like the poppies of which I spoke. After the same manner, we have the daffodils of spring. You must have all seen a field of them. The poet Wordsworth wrote a beautiful little poem about daffodils; you are sure to learn it at school one day.

Then the trees. Near where I live is a fine avenue. Trees are said to be green, and nothing but green, yet I never tire of looking from one end to the other of this straight familiar road. The trees that line it on each side are of many shades; one appears almost grey, another bright green, while a hoary example shows itself so dark that I sometimes think its place should be the forest. There are just a few copper beeches, and they give a delightful variety. If I were a poet I should write a sonnet about that avenue.

My boys and girls, colour is part of the scheme of God's earth, and He means us to love it. Travellers tell us that round about Nazareth there are a great many flowers. We know that there

were flowers when Jesus was a boy, and although the town itself must be very different to-day from what it was when He lived, the gaily-coloured flowers that grow on the hill just above Nazareth must, we believe, be almost the same as those on which Christ gazed. He loved them, and doubtless learnt many things from them about His Father. Looking abroad on the fields one day as He preached, He said: 'Consider the lilies of the field. . . . Yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.'

The flowers are set in a very large place. By and by, I hope you boys and girls will lift your eyes and look round about. You can do it now. I remember a little London boy being afraid when he first saw the dark gloomy mountains of the Highlands. He loved to play in the green fields, and to pluck the flowers, but he could not understand how the mountains could be called beautiful. The sun in the heavens, that makes the colours of the flowers for us, throws also the deep shadows upon the mountains. In the heat of day they often look dark, and gloomy, and fearsome, don't they? But I shall never forget a sunset I witnessed as I crossed the Minch one July evening. The mountains of the Hebrides, which had looked black and threatening all the afternoon, seemed to melt in a golden light. The crossing was not like being on the sea, it seemed as if I were sailing towards the Celestial City.

My young friends, your fathers and mothers, and even some of you, have been afraid of the shadows that have faced us all during the past months. But I believe the day is coming when we big people will be able to understand the truth of what many of you boys and girls learn at school, namely, that no colour is so beautiful as the colour that has depth. The sorrows, and the anxieties, and the joys of life, all go to the making of its depth. God has a great scheme of colour for this world. One day we shall thank our Father in heaven for it.

II.

For King and Country.

'Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.'—Dt 4^6.

When we read this Book of Deuteronomy, what strikes us most is the number of times that Moses urges the Israelites to keep the statutes of the Lord. Again and again he tells them that, if they love God and keep His commandments, it will be well with them; again and again he warns them that if they forsake God, and worship false gods, it will go ill with them. In this very chapter he foretells what will happen when the children of Israel become idolaters—God will scatter them among the peoples.

We know how true Moses' prophecy was. So long as Israel remembered the God who had delivered them out of Egypt, so long did they prosper. When they turned aside to do evil, God did indeed forgive and restore them many times; but, at last, when the people had almost entirely given themselves over to idolatry, He allowed the Assyrians to carry them away captive—first the ten tribes, and then the two remaining ones. Of the ten no more was heard. They disappeared as a nation, and mingled with the other races of the earth. But the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin returned, purified by their time of trial, and rebuilt Jerusalem and the Temple.

Yet Israel, in the days when she first dwelt in the land of Canaan, had in her the making of a great nation. She was the smallest of all nations; nevertheless, she made a name for herself. The Israelites drove out before them more powerful peoples. They were the admiration and the dread of rival tribes in those days when they trusted God and kept His statutes; for this was their wisdom and their understanding.

As it was said to Israel of old, so it might be said to Britain to-day. God has called Britain to a very high place among the nations. She stands for honour, and truth, and justice, but only in so far as she keeps God's statutes, and adheres firmly to her best ideals, will she continue to keep the high place to which she has attained.

At present we are in the midst of a life and death struggle for our very existence. The issue is certain, because we are fighting for honour and for right. What we do not know is what kind of people we are going to be after the war. This has been a tremendous upheaval, nothing will ever be the same again; and in the hands of the boys and girls lies the remaking of Britain.

At an American election the temperance party were defeated. On the day of the poll many people wore badges of little bits of coloured ribbon, showing with which side they sympathized. The following day, a message-boy who was on the temperance side still went about wearing his bit of ribbon,

which, of course, was blue. A servant girl at one house chaffed him about wearing the colours of a defeated party, but the boy replied proudly, 'Just wait a bit: it was the turn of the men yesterday, but it will be the turn of us boys soon.'

Many a boy at present regrets that he is too young to draw a sword for his country, but wait a bit: it will be the turn of you boys soon, and yours will be a glorious task, the task of rebuilding Britain.

The future of the nation depends on the boys and girls. Men are shedding their blood freely for her honour and safety. Are you going to make their sacrifice of none avail? You are standing at the beginning of the way. Life lies before you. It is yours to make or mar, and in making or marring your own life, you are helping to make or mar the life of the nation. Don't think you are too young or insignificant to matter. You *do* matter.

When Mr. Lloyd George was speaking lately in Wales, he told his hearers an ancient Welsh legend. It was the story of a man who was given a series of what appeared to be impossible tasks to perform ere he could reach the desires of his heart. Amongst other things, he had to recover every single grain of seed that had been sown in a large field, and bring it all in by sunset. The man made friends with a colony of ants, and enlisted their sympathies. They spread over the field, and, before sunset, the seed was all gathered in, except one grain. Then just as the sun was sinking behind the western hills, a lame ant came hobbling along bearing the last grain.

We can all do our little bit to help our country at this time, and at all times. If any of you fails to play your part, your country will be by so much the poorer. Even the lame ant cannot be spared.

Yours is a great heritage. You have been born a Briton, you have been born into a land that has always stood for truth, and honour, and freedom, and righteousness. Is Britain going to maintain its name? That depends on you.

Yours is a great privilege—the privilege of living in a great age. Walk worthy of your privilege. God is calling you to a glorious future. You will have opportunities that people in past ages have never had. Make the most of your opportunities.

What I wish you to remember most of all is, that we hold our greatness as a trust from God, and if we are not worthy of His trust, He will take away our power as He did that of Israel thousands of years ago. Perhaps Britain has been inclined to forget this in past years. She has had a time of great prosperity, and she has been tempted to say, 'My power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth.'

> If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
> Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe,
> Such boasting as the Gentiles use,
> Or lesser breeds without the Law—
> Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
> Lest we forget—lest we forget!

Britain has learned to remember in the fires of affliction, and the trust will be handed on to you. How are you going to keep it?

The most patriotic thing a boy or girl can do is to serve God, and keep His commandments. Only thus can you come to the full height of your manhood and womanhood; only thus can you hope to make your nation truly great. And what are God's commandments? The first is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.' And the second is this, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' There is none other commandment greater than these.

Boys and girls of Britain, your country is calling you to-day, your country needs you. Make up your minds to be absolutely straight and true. Make up your mind to live for others, to think of their sorrows and needs. Make up your mind to serve God, and in serving Him to serve your country. Prove worthy of your great trust, and then indeed shall a nobler Britain arise from the ruins of the old, and men shall say of us, 'Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.'

> Land of our birth, we pledge to thee
> Our love and toil in years to be;
> When we are grown and take our place
> As men and women with our race.
>
> Father in heav'n, who lovest all,
> Oh, help Thy children when they call;
> That they may build, from age to age,
> An undefiled heritage.
>
> Teach us to bear the yoke in youth,
> With steadfastness and careful truth;
> That, in our time, Thy grace may give
> The truth whereby the nations live.
>
> Teach us to rule ourselves alway,
> Controlled and cleanly night and day,
> That we may bring, if need arise,
> No maimed or worthless sacrifice.

Teach us to look, in all our ends,
On Thee for judge, and not our friends:
That we, with Thee, may walk uncowed
By fear or favour of the crowd.

Teach us the strength that cannot seek,
By deed or thought, to hurt the weak;
That, under Thee, we may possess
Man's strength to comfort man's distress.

Teach us delight in simple things,
And mirth that hath no bitter springs;
Forgiveness free of evil done,
And love to all men 'neath the sun!

Land of our birth, our faith, our pride,
For whose dear sake our fathers died;
O motherland, we pledge to thee,
Head, heart, and hand through the years to be.[1]

III.

The Rev. A. Stanley Parker has published a small volume of 'parable and story addresses to the young.' Its title is *Winning the Children* (Allenson; 1s. 6d. net). One of the parables is called

A Beautiful Work.

Many of the young people who are listening to me this morning will remember that when the woman broke the alabaster box of ointment and anointed the head of Christ somebody grumbled and said that it was a waste. No doubt Judas was the leader of those who saw no glory in the woman's deed.

But Jesus said, 'Let her alone; why trouble ye her? She has wrought a good work on Me.' Now the word translated 'good' in our version is, in the original, 'beautiful,' and so what Christ actually said was: 'She has wrought a *beautiful* work.'

Christ had a wonderful eye for beauty, whether in nature or in characters of men and women, and this fact comes out again and again in His teaching.

To-day I want to tell you the story of another beautiful deed. On the Continent there is a magnificent Cathedral, it is really gorgeous, and amongst its treasures are many fine specimens of statuary. The most celebrated piece is up near the roof in one of the darkest places in the building. It can only be seen once in the day just as the light of the sun shines through a certain window and reaches it. Many visitors assemble every day of the week at the appointed time to see that exquisite piece of workmanship, which at other times is lost in deep shadows. Day by day people wait for the shaft of light to creep along the wall until it reaches the sculpture, and then every eye is fixed upon it, and every observer is filled with wonder and admiration. It is a beautiful work, and there is a wonderful story attached to it.

The Rev. David Davies tells it as follows: When the Cathedral was built the authorities sent for the best sculptors, and among others, a feeble old man, leaning on his staff, came offering himself as a sculptor. They looked upon him with astonishment, and yet with admiration; for his look was so earnest and his countenance so refined. He begged that he might be permitted to take part in the work which had to be done. At length he was accepted; but the authorities took care to place him somewhere where his work would not be seen. Thus he had to ascend a scaffold high up near the roof, and in one of the gloomiest spots in the whole building. He went up quietly, patiently, and laboriously, until at last he reached that little scaffold. He lit his lamp early in the afternoon, for there was not enough light to enable him to work, and in the light of that little lamp he continued to chisel the rude block of marble that projected out of the wall. Every workman was busy at his work, and the old man at his. The others retired for their meals: he did not retire for his: he worked persistently on, and even when the others left at night he still remained. I am not sure whether he did this regularly, but this I know: that one evening—if not the first and only evening—he remained hard at work chiselling the marble when the others had left. On the following morning when the other workmen returned they saw the light of the lamp up on that lofty scaffold; but they could hear no noise of hammer or clink of chisel. Their curiosity was aroused, and at length some one was prompted to go up and look for the worker.

When he reached the scaffold, the sun shone brightly upon a sweet female countenance that had been grandly chiselled out of the marble block, and as he looked down upon the scaffold itself the same shaft of light poured its rays upon the pale face of the sculptor who lay dead upon the scaffold, surrounded by the hammers, chisels, and marble chips that spoke eloquently of the work he had done. Others were summoned to the spot: they looked at the face graven in the marble and were charmed by its beauty; and as they glanced at the

[1] Rudyard Kipling, *The Children's Song*.

face of the restful figure that lay prostrate upon the scaffold, they saw in it a kindred charm.

They inquired concerning the aged sculptor, and found from those who knew him that many years before, even early in life, he had lost his youthful wife and companion; and that ever since he had been a lonely man in the world, and had carried the memory of her with him wherever he went. And those who were old enough to remember that youthful wife said that the face in the marble was hers. Thus the pent-up feeling of many years in the old man's heart at length found expression in that last work. He had chiselled her beautiful face in that marble, and when he had finished and looked at it once more, as he had not done since she left him, he laid down his head to die: he had done his work. Surely we shall say: 'It was a beautiful work.'

I like this old man because he was willing to work at his best in an unseen place, and I am glad that, at the last, what he did was appreciated. It is beautiful also to think that he toiled on to the end, and that the motive behind his labour was love.

The Task of To-day.

By the Rev. Robert Oswald, B.D., Largs.

I.

'Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.' These words of St. Paul have long fascinated me. Often I desired to preach upon them; but whenever I attempted it they eluded me. What fascinated me was their picturesque metaphor of redeeming or buying back the time. I felt that for St. Paul the metaphor had a definite meaning, and counselled some definite attitude to evil circumstance; but when I tried to come to grips with it it always slipped from my grasp. More than once I turned to all the Critical Commentaries in my possession, books with the names of great scholars on their backs, but always to be disappointed. One and all of them agreed in saying that, though it was the almost invariable meaning of the Greek word, the picturesque rendering of 'redeeming' or 'buying back' must be given up, as yielding no clear meaning, and some colourless rendering substituted, such as 'making the best of opportunities,' or, to keep something of the commercial flavour, 'making the most of the market,' and that the more when, the days being evil, the opportunities of good were few, or the market bad. But are the opportunities of good fewer in evil days? What of Calvary?

I was not satisfied. I felt that this treatment was unjust to St. Paul. Great writers and thinkers, and he surely was both, do not use words loosely nor choose a colourful word to express a colourless thing. Their greatness consists largely in the aptness wherewith, as writers, they fit words to thoughts, and, as thinkers, thoughts to things. Why, if St. Paul meant that in evil days opportunities were few, did he not just say so? Why did he bring in the idea of buying back at all if he did not mean that action of ours might so change the effect of circumstances that from doing hurt they did good? I felt that the key to the right interpretation lay in the evil and the possibility of transforming it into good; but how it was to be done I could not discover. So I remained dissatisfied, convinced that the commentators' suggestion was banal, but with nothing definite to put in its place.

And then the other night I was musing on the manifold ills of these evil days. The measure of their evil was not the vast waste of wealth, though that was grievous. Nor was it the diversion of these millions of men, each of them a potential source of wealth, from production to destruction, though that was pitiful. Nor was it reached when you estimated the loss not in terms of economics but of life, and attempted to number the numberless fair young lives passing, so far as this life goes, into nothingness, their hopes and fears, their loves and hates, their joys and sorrows, their aspirations and endeavours, the experiences that shape souls, and the stuff out of which the fabric of life is woven, left unrealized for ever. No: beyond all that, they were working evil on us who remained. Lives innumerable were being robbed of their loves and hopes, and disappointment and

life-weariness laid up in store for them. Dream homes were being shattered before they were built, and dream children murdered before they were born. Hatreds were being engendered long to divide the nations, and false thoughts and false ideals to open gulfs betwixt them. Humanity was being turned from its progress to the promised land to wander how many weary years in the arid desert, who should tell.

Then I found myself asking, 'Need these evils be?' To be subdued to the colour of an evil time,—is that the only possible reaction we can show, can it ever be the morally proper reaction? If in its presence we are inert, it will be; but if we are up and doing, it need not. Can we not take every evil thing it contains and make it work not our evil but our good? Can we not make each of them a call to self-examination and self-condemnation, for it is man's evil that has produced these evils? Can we not make them provoke us to pity, to service, to sacrifice, to love? And then I found myself using St. Paul's very words, and I believe sharing St. Paul's very thought. Can we not *redeem* them from working hurt to us and others to working good? Can we not buy them back out of their enslavement to evil and make them servants of the good in us? And what shall the price be but our moral and spiritual rebellion against this supposed evil necessity, and our endeavours to overcome the evil with our good? And so, thought I, St. Paul is larger than his commentators. To redeem the time because the days are evil is a very practical and definite line of action, and it is precisely the evil in the days that makes it possible. The picturesque phrase, so long misunderstood, rings with a clear call to Christians of all nations to be up and doing, and defines in a way that grips the imagination and lays hold on the will the supreme task of our day, on whose due fulfilment the future of Europe turns.

II.

1. To understand more clearly St. Paul's thought and the call it brings us, think, first, how their time masters men. We are all children of our day. It sets us our problems and in its thought and spirit gives us the only tools by which we can solve them. We breathe its atmosphere. If we separate ourselves from it, mentally and morally we die. We can no more escape from the influence of our day than we can leap off our own shadows. Great and small we are involved in its meshes. Even the men we call epoch-makers—makers not only of their own but of many other days—cannot escape the universal human fate. And when their days are evil days, how shall men escape their evil influence?

2. Think, next, how men alone can master their time. The epochmakers show us how on the large scale. Whatever of the rest, they are not borne by the current. They make headway against it. How? As rowers do on a swift-flowing stream, who thrust their oar-blades into it, and by pulling on them gain a purchase that thrusts them through it. By their effort they transform what drags them down into what forces them up. Again, they rise above it. How? As a bird does that beats downward on the resisting air and makes out of a hindrance a means of upward flight. We might indeed hold that the great man, independent though he seem, even more than others is dependent on his time. It is the stimulus of its problems and its shortcomings that rouses him to questioning and effort. It is its methods and its solutions that rouse him to criticism and to invention. Without its material he would have nothing to work on, no place to jump off. He needs its resistance. It evokes his antagonism and rouses him to reshape the time that would shape him. He masters his time by redeeming it.

3. Think, again, how in one respect all men can master their time. You tell me all this is useless, that as neither you nor I are great men, certainly not epochmakers, their great way is not open to us. I agree and yet I disagree. In one respect, and that the most important of all, their way *is* open to us. We ought not to suffer evil to make us evil, and we need not. We ought to overcome it with good, and we can. The plea of incapacity will be refused us at the judgment. Here each of us can and ought to say,

> 'I am the master of my fate,
> I am the captain of my soul.'

Brave Enid in the 'Idylls of the King' could not overmaster the floods of misfortune that drove her and her house on a rocky shore; but she could so face them that they wrought in her a bravery of spirit and scorn of compliance that redeemed them from hostility to service.

'Turn, Fortune, turn thy wheel with smile or frown;
With that wild wheel we go not up or down;
Our hoard is little, but our hearts are great.

Smile and we smile, the lords of many lands;
Frown and we smile, the lords of our own hands;
For man is man and master of his fate.'

In this most important of all respects we can all redeem the time. 'Whatsoever be the matter of human actions,' said Archbishop Leighton, 'the spiritual mind hath that alchemy indeed of turning base metals into gold, earthly employments into heavenly.' And what is that but to redeem the time?

III.

In the redeeming of the time there are two steps, each embalmed in a great word of Scripture:

(1) We must resist the pressure of the evil time. So the author of Hebrews tells us that 'the peaceable fruit of righteousness' is yielded not to every one to whom chastening comes, but only to those who 'are exercised thereby.' Note well these words 'exercised thereby,' and understand that the Greek word means 'stirred to activity, to the strenuous activity of an athlete.' There are many who have not noted this truth, and attribute to circumstance that which only the activity of a spirit reacting on it can bring us. They talk of sorrow as if sorrow of itself refined. It is likelier to weaken. They confound humiliation and humility, and speak as if humiliation of itself could make a man. It is more likely to break him. In temptation, too, there is vaguely thought to lie what can make a man strong. But these are all illusions. Gifts these three stern sisters can bring us, but they can become ours only if we pluck them forcibly from their hands. They will profit us only if we are exercised by them, stimulated to resistance, to denial of their mastery over us, till, reaching inward, we find some elixir within us that transmutes them from hostility to friendliness, or, reaching upward, find in God comfort against them and strength to win a victory over them. Such things as sorrow, humiliation, and temptation are among the evils that make evil days and will work our hurt and not our weal, unless by effort of resistance we redeem them from evil to good.

And as with men so with nations. Ours are certainly evil days. Will they profit us? Will they leave us larger, stronger, greater? Only if we are exercised by them, exercised in the sense of the writer of Hebrews, roused to resist the manifold evils that are in them. So many seem to acquiesce in them, and go about their business, and even their pleasure, as usual, feeling nothing of the gigantic tragedy and doing nothing to end it, in the only way morally open to us, by carrying through to its bitter end the great task providence has set us. Ah! those feeling nothing, doing nothing, reacting not at all on the evil, will let the time pass unredeemed and emerge smaller, weaker, despicable.

(2) But it is not enough to say, React. What kind of reaction shall we make? Again our wonderful Scriptures give us the answer and complete the account of how to set about redeeming the time: 'Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.'

Hard to practise, it is almost harder to believe. It makes a great demand on our spirits and almost a greater on our faith. It seems so weak a policy, so certain to invite reprisals and confirm the foe in evil. It seems so foolish, and it is; but it is with that foolishness of God which is wiser than men.

In so far as this war is a conflict of political ideals this seems to be its inner meaning. Our foes, with their ideal of 'Kultur,' which is not what we mean by 'culture,' seem far back in the stream of political development. By 'Kultur' they do not mean as we do the refining of the whole spiritual nature, head, heart, and conscience, but the ruthless and external application of scientifically-thought-out organization of life, and that irrespective of the moral quality of the ends in view. They have not learned, as we have learned, the meaning of liberty and order based on liberty. They have not learned to trust to loyalty begotten of wise and just dealing rather than to the drill-sergeant and the policeman. They have not learned the wisdom of letting men speak out their thoughts. They do not believe in a throne broad based upon a people's will, and on the goodwill of other peoples. They show a man's intellect conjoined with a schoolboy's crudeness of judgment and belief in that obvious which is never the way things work and men act. We sincerely believe our policy to be the wiser and maturer far, wise with a wisdom that seems foolish and weak, but has the wisdom and strength of God. We fight to defend ourselves and the world from domination by a policy so clever yet so immature, and its train of attendant evils.

But beyond this, how great a task is set us: to overcome evil with good; to wage war so as, if it may be, to end war; to bring nearer the peace that is founded on liberty and righteousness; to reap as fruit of victory the toilsome privilege of laying the foundations of greater amity and helpfulness among the nations; and at home to carry into the days of peace the marvellous unity the war in its first days brought us, and, working as never before for the good of the whole, to secure justice and opportunity for all classes. These things and many more, fraught with future blessing to our empire and the race, we may pluck as the fair fruit of these evil days—no, not of them, for a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, but as the fruit of our spirits, roused to activity and new moral richness by the shock of the evil of these evil days. These fair fruits may be ours, but only if we redeem the time, buy it back from enslavement to evil, and enfranchise it into the service of our good and others' good, by opposing its evils and meeting all its burdens, temptations, and trials in a spirit of humility, of large-hearted justice, of sacrifice, service, and love, not to our own people but to all.

Because the days are very evil, the supreme task for individuals and nations is, in St. Paul's pregnant figure, to redeem the time.

Contributions and Comments.

The Semitic *iau*.

Professor König, in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1915, Part I. p. 45, appears to imply that I am responsible for Professor Hehn's dissertation on *iau* and *Jahweh*, in his *Biblische und Babylonische Gottesidee*. He also cites a private communication from Professor Clay condemning my statement in most categorical fashion. I regret to say that Professor König has abused Dr. Clay's confidence, who has no memory of having made such statement, and did not authorize the publication of any opinion. Moreover, I am sorry to say that I do not believe Professor König really read carefully the little philological note in The Expository Times, xxii. 139. I did not assert that *iau* means 'existence'; that is Dr. Hehn's thesis, and is in my opinion erroneous. The note in The Expository Times simply refers to the passage in the syllabar in question, where *au*, the Sumerian word for 'what,' is explained by the Semitic *ia'u* (feminine *ia-a-ti*). This interrogative pronoun *iau*, *iāti*, and its plural forms, is thoroughly established and accepted in all Assyrian grammars. This is the full extent of my statement, and if read with care should not be used for further illogical deductions.

S. Langdon.

Oxford.

Light on ἐνεργεῖν from War and Music.

The word ἐνεργεῖν, to which you draw attention in your April issue, has light thrown on it both by the war and by music. Its use as a transitive verb seems to have originated with a military writer, and its application to music interprets that use.

The adjective ἐνεργός, from which the verb is formed, is largely used by Xenophon in the sense of 'active,' 'productive'; *e.g.* of *land* capable of yielding crops; of *mines* opened up and ready to yield ore; of *money* which through wise legislation is capable of yielding interest; of an *army* so arranged as to be effective or ready to strike; of *troopers* whom hunting has trained in the use of weapons on horseback. We cannot be sure whether it always strictly means *with work in it*, like ἔναιμος, 'full of blood,' ἔνθεος, 'full of the god,' ἔνθηρος, 'full of wild beasts'; or whether it sometimes has the sense of 'in work,' like ἔναρχος, 'in office,' ἔμμισθος, 'in pay,' ἔμφρουρος, 'on guard,' and many others: for it may be capable of both senses, like ἔντεχνος, which can mean both 'within the province of art' and 'full of art' (in the sense either of 'skilful' or of 'artificial'), and ἔνυδρος, which is applied alike to a bowl for holding water and to a reed whose *habitat* is the water.

When Xenophon wants, as he often does, to speak of '*making* active' ('productive,' 'serviceable'), he uses this adjective with ποιεῖν or one of

the other familiar Greek verbs for 'render.' So do Demosthenes and Isocrates. But in the interval (about two centuries) between Xenophon and Polybius, Aristotle had brought in the verb ἐνεργεῖν to express 'putting forth an activity,' especially a mental one, using it always intransitively. It would seem that in this interval ἐνεργός had come to be used, as we often use 'active,' for '*full* of work,' 'yielding *much*,' that is to point the contrast not between the worker and the non-worker, but between the strenuous worker and the slacker. For Polybius often uses it of a march or an attack or the like in which there is action already. However this may be, Polybius laid hold of Aristotle's verb ἐνεργεῖν and used it as a transitive, and if we let the application of the verb to music guide us, we are led to think that he used it as an equivalent for Xenophon's periphrasis ἐνεργὸν ποιεῖν.

Of the use of ἐνεργεῖν in connexion with music we have evidence (*a*) in Plutarch, who, wishing to speak of 'the performer' (with voice or instrument), writes ὁ ἐνεργῶν (ii. 1144, E.). As he habitually uses the verb either purely intransitively, or with a pronoun like τι or ὁτιοῦν, which is little more than an accusative of the verb's own action, we are not at liberty to supply after ὁ ἐνεργῶν an accusative either of the instrument played or of the music produced. But (*b*), in his homily on Ro 7^5, St. Chrysostom uses language that makes it clear that ἐνεργεῖν was familiarly used like our 'play' of 'making active' the instrument or of producing the musical sound as your (and the instrument's) activity. He dwells on the fact that St. Paul, in his anxiety not to vilify the flesh, οὐκ εἶπεν ἃ ἐνήργει τὰ μέλη ἀλλὰ ἃ ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν (*sic*), and thus marked the truth that wickedness took its rise in the other part of our being (ἑτέρωθεν), namely, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνεργούντων λογισμῶν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων μελῶν, 'from the reasoning powers that *make active*, not from the bodily members that *are made active*.' For, he continues, 'the soul held the place of a musician (τεχνίτου), while the fleshly nature held that of a lyre, which gave forth such sounds as the musician compelled it to utter.' Here the members of the body are the instrument, the passions (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν), the tune, the soul (or the reasoning powers), the musician; and, while the musician alone ἐνεργεῖ, ἐνεργεῖσθαι is used alike of the tune produced and of the instrument by whose means it is produced.

It is to be noted that St. Chrysostom does not give the illustration any introduction, as though it were unfamiliar. St. Paul has used a word which of itself suggests the illustration.

This musical application of the verb is of considerable importance towards the interpretation of its military application in Polybius, especially in view of the fact that he does not ever (so far as I can find) use ποιεῖν with the adjective as Xenophon and others before him do.[1] For instance, when he tells us that Philip in his lifetime οὐκ ὀλίγα ἐνήργησε καὶ παρεσκευάσατο πρὸς τὸν κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν πόλεμον (iii. 6. 5), we have good ground for taking him to mean that Philip 'made active' many national organizations, 'put into working order' much that was only on paper, set on foot alliances and intrigues, all which things became secondary causes of the war. Again, when he says that the sovereign assembly of the Bœotians, having determined on alliance with Rome, ἐπέταξαν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἐνεργεῖν τὴν συμμαχίαν (xxvii. 1. 12), it is to be supposed that he means that they directed the Executive 'to translate the alliance into action,' or more simply 'to mobilize the Expeditionary Force,' 'to bring their contingent to efficiency.'[2]

If we are on the right line, there is much to be said for 'make active' (or 'effective') as the meaning of ἐνεργεῖν in the N.T., *e.g.* in Eph $1^{11,3}$ and for taking ἐνεργεῖται to mean 'is caused to put forth activity,' in such places as 1 Th 2^{13}, though it may be pedantic in rendering always to press the Passive force. As ἐμαλακίσθη can mean either 'he was made soft' (by indulgent parents) or 'he was proved soft' (by the test of the trenches), and would often be expressed in English by 'he proved himself soft,' so in 1 Th 2^{13} St. Paul seems to say of the 'word of God,' which the Thessalonians have received, that 'it is actually proving effectual among (or in) you.'

In Ja 5^{16}, the point which St. James is pressing as well as the proper force of the word suggest that ἐνεργουμένη means 'being filled with activity' (by

[1] Polybius frequently employs the periphrasis for the verb consisting of ποιεῖσθαι with the cognate noun, adding the predicative adjective, which, had the verb itself been used, would have been an *adverb*. Thus ἐνεργὸν ἐποιεῖτο τὴν πορείαν is not 'he rendered his march a forced one,' but 'he made his march at a forced pace.'

[2] This sense of συμμαχία is found in Thucydides (vi. 73) and Xenophon (*Hell.*, iv. 8. 24, vi. 1. 13), and often in Josephus.

[3] See Dr. Murray's note in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*; and cp. 1 Ti 6^{13}, τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα.

God), that is to say, that the righteous man's petition is the instrument, by which ὁ ἐνεργῶν effects the harmonies of His universe. As by drought and rainfall God honoured Elijah's prayer, so does He cause a righteous man's petition to be effective in the saving of a soul from death and covering a multitude of sins.

P.S.—The above was written before your May issue reached me. Dr. Moulton *seems* ready to give up the derivation of ἐνεργεῖν from ἐνεργός, and to suggest that in N.T. it has the sense of 'in-work' or 'inspire.' Does he really adopt this position?

That *Divine* activity is often implied in ἐνεργεῖν does not at all show that, as applied to prayer, it points to Divine *suggestion*, a sense alien to the verb. And the fact that the Book of Kings makes it clear that Elijah did not entreat God for the drought 'from a mere personal conviction that his people needed it,' does not at all show that St. James is calling attention to Elijah's freedom from this grave disqualification. Would he have called one so praying 'a righteous man'?

Even if we are right in assuming that in Ja $5^{14f.}$ ἀσθενεῖν and κάμνειν refer to bodily weakness and trouble, the close of the Epistle shows that what fills St. James' thoughts is the forgiveness of sins, and the amazing power given to Christian people to effect it.

May I add a few words regarding Ph $2^{12f.}$, a passage to which Dr. Moulton refers, and in which the verb ἐνεργεῖν occurs not once but twice? Is not ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας the clue to the meaning of the two verses? What 'the Father's good pleasure' is, has just been proclaimed in vv.$^{9-11}$. It is the gathering of all in Jesus Christ into the Father's Home. St. Paul has not left the subject on which he definitely entered at 1^{27}—unity, fellowship. So when he says τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν, he means the salvation of the Christian *community* at Philippi, as St. Peter by τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπην means love of the brethren (1 P 4^{8}). In the endeavour to work the God-given ore, to digest the God-given food, of the salvation of the Body to which they belong, they must be filled with a sense of being on holy ground, feel that they are engaged on a task of supreme dignity, 'for it is God (and none other) that *makes active* in you both to will the victory of His good pleasure and to *make* that will *fruitful*.' 'You are putting your hands to the work which the Lord Himself has won for His Body as the reward of His obedience even unto death. In bearing with and cheering and helping one another and looking to it that no member of your community come short of the grace of God, you are aiming at that which God approves, the desire for which is from Him, and the achievement of which He will make to speed.' G. H. Whitaker.

Liskeard.

James v. 16.

I.

In common, no doubt, with many other readers of The Expository Times, I am much interested in what you say, in the April number, on the force of ἐνεργουμένη. That the verb is *Passive* seems beyond question. Indeed, although it has hitherto been customary to regard it as *Middle* in other places where it occurs—Ro 7^{5}, 2 Co 1^{6} 4^{12}, Gal 5^{6}, Eph 3^{20}, Col 1^{29}, 1 Th 2^{13}, 2 Th 2^{7}, yet, in almost every one of these passages, a *Passive* sense is quite discernible.

With the rendering of so competent authority as Dr. Rendel Harris—'The prayer of a righteous man is of great force [when] energised,' no one can find serious fault. But, you ask what does 'energised' mean? How would [*when*] *carried into action* do as an explanation and as an equivalent? Manifestly, the prayer, in the Apostle's mind, is not a *faint* sort of thing—a mere *wish*, but something carried out into reality by being *purposely presented* to the throne of Grace. Compare Gal 5^{6}—πίστιν δι ἀγάπην ἐνεργουμένη, where the meaning is, faith *wrought out*, *carried into action*, by deeds. One may be allowed to say that the Revisers show needless timidity in their treatment of this parallel text—assigning 'wrought' only to the *margin*. P. Thomson.

The Manse, Dunning.

II.

I was very interested in reading your notes, in The Expository Times for June, on the passage in St. James' Epistle—'The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.' It struck me that possibly we meet with another illustration of the fervency of intercessory prayer in Col 4^{12}, where we read of Epaphras who laboured fervently in

prayer for the members of the Colossian Church. In this case it appears to me we have a striking instance of the harmony which obtains in this direction between the teaching of St. Paul and that of St. James. E. Over.

St. Saviour's Vicarage, Preston.

Corrigenda and Addenda to the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon.

I. Corrigenda.

Page.	*Line.*	
5[a].	11	. . *For* 2 S 13[14] *read* 15[14].
5[a].	30	. . *For* ביה *read* בי״ v. p. 106[a].
48[a].	4 fr. ft.	*For* Is 13[7] *read* 13[22].
48[a].	3 ,,	*For* מעון *read* [עון] v. p. 732[b].
74[b].	8 ,,	,, ,,
81[b].	4	. . *For* Dt 16[1] *read* 16[21].
81[b].	8	. . *For* Je 17[20] *read* 17[2].
198[b].	8	. . *For* Je 47[15] *read* 47[5].
368[b].	3 fr. ft.	*For* ו *read* ו.
375[b].	21	. . *For* ψ 31[30] *read* 31[20].
382[b].	11 fr. ft.	*For* tear rend *read* tear, rend.
424[b].	10	. . *For* Ezr 8[7] *read* 8[17].
560[b].	17 fr. ft.	*For* 2 S 19[13] *read* 1 K 2[26].
560[b].	16 ,,	*For* 1 K 2[26] *read* 2 S 19[13].
618[a].	15 ,,	*For* Am 5[10] *read* 5[20].
618[a].	14 ,,	,, ,,
643[a].	14 ,,	*For* Is 3[16] *read* 3[19].
656[a].	15 ,,	*For* Pr 25[4] *read* 25[11].
657[b].	11 ,,	*For* Ju 9[12] *read* 7[12].
673[a].	4	. . *For* מַאֲשָׂה *read* מַשָּׂאָה.
688[b].	21 fr. ft.	*For* v.[58] *read* v.[28].
694[a].	17 ,,	*For* 2 K 16[32] *read* 6[32].
719[a].	22	. . *For* Qal 6e *read* Qal 6f.
722[b].	23	. . *For* e *read* c.
735[b].	14	. . *For* Je 15[9] *read* 15[8].
777[a].	10 fr. ft.	*For* Is 14[22] *read* 13[22].
817[b].	21	. . *For* Mi 1[13] *read* 2[13].
830[a].	11	. . *For* ψ 136[4] *read* 136[24].
832[a].	14 fr. ft.	*For* Ezr 4[11] *read* 7[11].
856[a].	7 ,,	*For* La 3[63] *read* 3[53].
857[b].	3 ,,	*For* Is 3[30] *read* 3[20].
943[a].	2	. . *For* Lv 20[55] *read* 20[25].
943[a].	24	. . *For*] *read* [ ].
949[b].	8 fr. ft.	*For* Jb 34[34] *read* 34[24].
952[a].	17 ,,	*For* Is 26[4] *read* 26[14].
976[b].	8 ,,	*For* Ne 3[24] *read* 3[34].
1005[a].	18 ,,	*For* 1 S 16[4] *read* 2 S 16[4].
1013[b].	13 fr. ft.	*For* Dt 22[25] *read* 32[25].
1030[b].	9 ,,	*For* La 1[14] *read* 1[4].
1076[b].	10 ,,	*For* Ez 1[6] *read* 1[16].

II. Addenda.

38[a]. 30 No reference is made to the rendering וְאֹכֶל under בָּלָה, p. 477[b], but its meaning is given under אִיתִיאֵל, p. 87[a].

321[a]. 3 *Add* Ez 21[19. 19] 30[24].

477[b]. Under *2b add* ref. to 38[a] line 30 (Pr 30[1]).

555[b]. 16 מַהֲתַלּוֹת 'deceits' (Is 30[10]) is omitted under תלל, p. 1068.

783[a]. *Add* after עֶצֶם the word עָצֶם, verb-denom. Pi. *to break any one's bones* (Je 50[17]). See Kautzsch, *Ges. Heb. Gr.* (trans. by A. E. Cowley), Oxf. 1910, p. 142, line 8.

862[a]. 11 *Add* Ez before 17[23].

969[b]. 22 *Add* Ez 39[9] after ב rei.

995[a]. 7 *Add* ψ 106[37] after Dt 32[17].

1031[b]. 4 *Add* after שְׁמָמָה the word as pointed שְׁמֵמָה (Ez 35[9]). See Gesenius' *Heb. Lex.* (trans. by S. P. Tregelles), London, 1847, p. 935[b].

1068[b]. *Add* after [תָּלַל] the word מַהֲתַלּוֹת. See p. 555[b] above, and Gesenius' *Lex.* (Tregelles), p. 454[b].

Biblical Aramaic.

1086[a]. Between lines 5 and 6 fr. foot, *add* the word [נוּחַ, נֵיחַ], verb Haph., *to break forth* (Dn 7[2]). See Gesenius' *Lex.* (Tregelles), p. 168[b].

1111[b]. Between lines 8 and 9, *add* the word [קְצִין], verb Pa. *to cut off* (Dn 4[11]). See Gesenius' *Lex.* (Tregelles), p. 738[b]. James Donald.

Keithhall Manse, Aberdeenshire.

Love and the Best Love.

Notwithstanding all the wonderful and wealthy verbal gleanings of our lexicographers from all languages ancient and modern since 1611, the Revisers of the New Testament have not been able to get rid of the difficulty which faced the compilers of the Authorized Version with regard to

the Greek synonyms ἀγαπάω and φιλέω. Some credit, however, is due to the Revisers for informing the reader in the footnote Jn 21[15-17] that the English word 'love in these places represents two different Greek words.' This means that we have only one word in the English language to express two different ideas in the Greek mind, and that neither of these two different ideas can be adequately or correctly expressed by the English word *love*.

The root idea for this word in the Anglo-Saxon mind was *to desire* or *to please*, and it is as surprising as it is disappointing that with all the accumulation of verbal riches since 1611 we have not been able to import or coin a word that will more nearly approach the meaning of one if not two of the Greek words.

Ἀγαπάω is the love of reflexion, calculation, and premeditation: in its highest reaches it means *admiration*: in its lowest levels it means *selfishness*: it is united with the consciousness of having made a wise, worthy, and beneficial choice. Thus our Lord in addressing Peter (Jn 21[15]) asks ἀγαπᾷς με; He here suits the word to the nature and expectations of Peter as He, perhaps alone of all men, understood them. He appeals to His own supreme worthiness and the Apostle's greatest advantage:—no one, and nothing has such a claim, and no one and nothing can make such a return.

When our Lord uses this word as expressing the love of the Father towards Himself or His disciples, as He often does, we need not eliminate the ideas of reflexion, calculation, and premeditation, but only remember that these ideas connote in the mind of the Omniscient that which is *beyond* as well as that which is *within* the range of human intelligence. When used of friends or enemies it will well bear the interpretation suggested.

Φιλέω is the love of emotion—warm, generous, free, venturesome, hazardous, gushing—uncalculating as to consequences. In its highest reaches it means *adoration*: in its lowest levels it means *sentimentality*, not always of an honourable kind, and may be expressed in a kiss, even the kiss of Judas.

It captures the mind of the Greek student of the Gospels, and holds him in exegetical inquiry when he meditates on the use of this word by Peter in Jn 21[15-17]. Our Lord's first question, ἀγαπᾷς με; Peter's first answer, φιλῶ σε,—the same words used by each in the second question and answer.

Was the Apostle rising out of the old nature—a new, converted man? (Lk 22[31. 32]). When he used this word φιλέω, did he say in his soul,

Less of self and more of Thee?

or even,

None of self and all of Thee?

More interesting and entrancing still is it to note that in the same passage (v.[17]) Jesus makes use of Peter's word in the third time question—φιλεῖς με; Why is this? Was it not that our Lord was desirous to remind the Apostle that there was uncertainty as to the ultimate value and permanence of a love of emotion, or a love springing from emotion, because such love is only too apt to express itself hurriedly and unthinkingly in gushing effusiveness? As if He had said, 'Dost thou indeed love me with *such* a love?' Certain it is that without such a love the spirit of the martyr would never be called forth, but then we may infer from our Lord's use of ἀγαπάω in the first and second question; and in the solemn warning of v.[18] that a love—a soul passion—which did not include the ideas conveyed in the two words, would be unequal to the martyrdom or the obedience.

One finds satisfaction in concluding that in this interchange of ideas between our Lord and this Apostle the latter received from our Lord a knowledge of the nature, demands, and powers of the deepest passions of the soul such as he had never had before, and that whilst he acknowledges that Jesus knew his needs for apostleship, he himself perceives himself in possession ('strangely warmed') of the supply. That the word he had begun to use with perhaps 'the flattery that was satisfying and not sinful,' he ended in using as truly descriptive of that 'affection whose joy is in itself, and is ever its own reward.'

Wm. J. Pearce.

Grimsby.

'Mine Hour is not yet Come' (John ii. 4).

These words have always been a difficulty with commentators, and it does not seem to have occurred to any to treat them as a question.

Mary, in her distress about the wine, turns to her son for sympathy and help. He comforts her with the words, 'Never mind, has not mine hour

now come?' Professor Burkitt has pointed out that τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί means 'never mind' or 'do not worry' (EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xxiv. p. 2); and if we translate the words οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου as a question, we understand why Mary, in her relief, immediately turns to the διάκονοι, and says,

'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.'

For rendering οὔπω as an interrogative we may compare Mt 16[9], Mk 8[17], οὔπω νοεῖτε.

Our Lord's hour for showing His power had now come, and 'this beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee.' The idyllic scene is perfect—and no jarring note now mars its beauty.

AUGUSTUS POYNDER.

Jersey.

'Stumbling-block.'

WITH the main question of the meaning of σκάνδαλον, Professor Moulton has dealt, and I shall not refer directly to this question, but in Job 40[19] (LXX) there is an otherwise unknown word ἐνσκολιευόμενος representing, according to the Hebrew, some such sense as (pierced through his nose) 'with a snare. (The plural בְּמוֹקְשִׁים, Mr. H. M'Lachlan writes, 'may be a plural of amplification suggesting the size of the snare required for Behemoth.') For this I originally suggested some change which would give some compound of the σκάνδαλον root, but the Rev. Mr. L. W. Grensted called my attention to the fact that σκῶλον occurs in some places as a variant for σκάνδαλον, and further investigation suggests that the change we have to make in the Job passage should be in this direction. Archdeacon Allen refers to Ex 10[7] and Dt 7[16] for the occurrence of σκῶλον to translate the same Hebrew root giving the idea of 'snare' as occurs in Job. Boisacq negatives the suggestion of Professor Moulton to connect σκῶλον with σκολιός, as if it were 'a trap with a kink in the entrance,' and we should rather find the sense of a 'sharp stake that will transfix the victim' (cf. σκόλοψ). In Hos 9[8], to which the archdeacon also refers, I should be inclined to find again an unknown adjective σκωλιά, just as Aquila has ἐσκωλωμένη. The meaning of this last word must be *furnished with a sharp stake*, not, as L. and S. say, *offended*, the sense of which seems sadly to seek. In one passage (Pr 18[7]) noticed by Mr. Grensted, σκῶλον is the word used by Aq., Symm., The., for LXX παγίς, and this suggests that Aquila at least regarded παγίς as an unsatisfactory equivalent in other passages. In Ps 18[5] (LXX 17[5]) παγίς is parallel to a word probably meaning 'cord for a hunter's snare,' and generally translated σχοῖνος, but here by a different pointing of חֶבֶל as חֶבֶל, ὠδίς; this is not unlike the variation pointed out by Dr. Marshall between Lk 21[34] and Th 5[3]. A reference to Ps 68[23], where παγίς and σκάνδαλον are both used, suggests that σκάνδαλον was perhaps a prop or sometimes an unstable stone supporting the bait ('the table') set in the middle of a pit, from which escape was impossible. The bait would be reached by a precarious gangway which would fall when the σκάνδαλον was upset. This will enable us to understand Is 28[16] when compared with Is 8[14. 15]. In some cases, perhaps, a large rock was poised above, which descended when the σκάνδαλον was struck. Mr. Grensted refers also to Jg 8[26] and Is 57[14].

P.S.—In L. and S. the reference for σκῶλος (or σκῶλον) to 2 Paralip, should be 28[23] (not [18]). All evidence seems to show that L. and S. need to be corrected further by bringing all the LXX occurrences under σκῶλον, and reserving σκῶλος for pre-Hellenistic passages. T. NICKLIN.

Entre Nous.

Illustrations from the War.

The Editor offers a set of the *Great Texts of the Bible* (twenty volumes), or their equivalent in other books chosen from Messrs. T. & T. Clark's catalogue, for the best series of illustrations of the Bible on religious and ethical topics from incidents connected with the War. He offers also a set of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible* (six volumes)—or their equivalent as before—for the second best series. The texts or topics illustrated should be given, and the source of the illustration, together with the date.

The illustrations should be sent before the end of August. They must refer to incidents occurring not earlier than February.

L. MacLean Watt.

The Saviour of Men, by the Rev. L. MacLean Watt (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 6d. net), is a poet's presentation of the gospel. The poet is found not in the language only, but also in the whole imaginative interpretation. Jesus was a poet; as an Eastern He could not be other than imaginative, and it needs a poet's instinct to translate Him. This is a beautiful book for Christians, and thoughtful as it is beautiful.

Maeterlinck.

Maeterlinck's essay on *Old-Fashioned Flowers* has been translated by A. T. de Mattos, and published along with 'other Open-Air Essays' by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (2s. 6d. net). As in the *Book of the Bee*, Maeterlinck gives knowledge in this book along with pleasure. He has many interesting facts to tell us, but he always surrounds them with an imaginative atmosphere. 'What flowers then,' he asks, 'blossomed in the gardens of our fathers? They were very few, no doubt, and very small and very humble, scarce to be distinguished from those of the roads, the fields and the glades. Have you ever observed the poverty and the monotony, most skilfully disguised, of the floral decoration of the finest miniatures in our old manuscripts? Again, the pictures in our museums, down to the end of the Renascence period, have only five or six types of flowers, incessantly repeated, wherewith to enliven the richest palaces, the most marvellous views of Paradise. Before the sixteenth century, our gardens were almost bare; and, later, Versailles itself, Versailles the splendid, could have shown us only what the poorest village shows to-day. Alone, the Violet, the Garden Daisy, the Lily of the Valley, the Marigold, the Poppy, a few Crocuses, a few Irises, a few Colchicums, the Foxglove, the Valerian, the Larkspur, the Cornflower, the Wild Pink, the Forget-me-not, the Gillyflower, the Mallow, the Rose, still almost a Sweetbriar, and the great silver Lily, the spontaneous ornaments of our woods and of our snow-frightened, wind-frightened fields: these alone smiled upon our forefathers, who, for that matter, were unaware of their poverty. Man had not yet learnt to look around him, to enjoy the life of nature. Then came the Renascence, the great voyages, the discovery and the invasion of the sunlight. All the flowers of the world, the successful efforts, the deep, inmost beauties, the joyful thoughts and wishes of the planet rose up to us, borne on a shaft of light that, in spite of its heavenly wonder, issued from our own earth. Man ventured forth from the cloister, the crypt, the town of brick and stone, thegloomy stronghold in which he had slept. He went down into the garden, which became peopled with bees, purple and perfumes; he opened his eyes, astounded like a child escaping from the dreams of the night; and the forest, the plain, the sea and the mountains and, lastly, the birds and the flowers, that speak in the name of all a more human language which he already understood, greeted his awakening.'

L. G. Fison.

Mr. L. G. Fison is not a poet though he calls his book, *In Pastime Wrought*, poems (Drane; 3s. 6d.). He has plenty of pretty fancies but little creative imagination. And in all the variety of his verse there is no true feeling for rhythm. Take this as an example:

EPIGRAM.

'O Father! they say there's a Holy Land,
O say if such can be?'
'Yes, yes,' he replied, 'but, my son, there is
As well a Holy See.'

W. B. Cotton.

Mr. Cotton is less confident. He is content to call his book *Verses* (Thacker; 1s.). Here is one quotable poem.

A MESSAGE.

Upon a wintry, leafless bower
There hung a pale, proud passion flower,
Its purple blossoms clinging
In clusters to the dreary home
Where this dear plant had chanced to roam,
Its joy and fragrance bringing.

A desolate forgotten place
This sweetest flower had deigned to grace,
Its slender tendrils twining
About the long neglected spot,
As if to mitigate its lot
And soothe its sad repining.

Where all was drear and sorrowing
It brought a message of the spring,
This queen of all the garden,
Awakening the wilderness
To memories of happiness,
Despair to hope of pardon.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

To the literature of the Fourth Gospel a charming addition has been made by Professor Percy GARDNER. It is charming, not because we are likely to agree with the conclusions to which its author comes, but because we see that he comes to his conclusions honestly and competently, and that then he expresses them in language of quite unusual felicity.

The Fourth Gospel is called *The Ephesian Gospel*, and that is the title of the book (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). It is called the Ephesian Gospel because it was written in Ephesus. Of that Professor GARDNER has no doubt. The tradition goes back to the second century, 'and there is no rival view of any importance.' It is called the Ephesian Gospel, however, most of all because in this book Professor GARDNER lays stress on its relation to the religion and thought of 'the most important of the Greek cities of Asia Minor.'

And so the question is raised at once, Who wrote the Ephesian Gospel? Professor GARDNER says we do not know. He even says we shall never know. But, in spite of that, he comes very near to telling us. He says that there are three Johns to think about. There is John the Apostle, who could not have written it. There is John the Prophet, who wrote the Apocalypse, and therefore could not have written it. And there is John the Elder, who wrote the two short 'Epistles according to St. John,' and who on that account could not have written it. The Gospel and the first Epistle were certainly written by the same man. Who was he, and what was his name? We do not know what his name was, but Dr. Percy GARDNER believes that he was a disciple of John the Apostle.

Why could not John the Apostle have written the Ephesian Gospel himself? Professor GARDNER gives several reasons. First of all, he says generally that John the son of Zebedee is so improbable that we may regard him as set aside. Next, he says that as a literary composition it is quite beyond the powers of the fisherman of Galilee. 'It is very doubtful whether John the fisherman of Galilee would have had sufficient literary training to write any continuous composition, above all a composition in a language so little familiar to the Galilean peasants as Greek.' Then it seems to him 'quite incredible that if the Apostle John were the actual writer of the Gospel, he should have designated himself in it by the phrase "the disciple whom Jesus loved."' And finally, 'it is all but impossible that one who had been an actual companion of Jesus should have had all his recollections so transmuted in course of time that the Jesus reflected in the Synoptic Gospels should

have become transformed into the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel.'

So, you see, there is no actual evidence against the Apostle or in favour of another. It is all a matter of the impossible and the improbable. And as soon as Professor GARDNER'S improbables and impossibles are examined by some one else they have a way of passing into the possible and the probable. They do so sometimes even in his own hands. The last, for example. 'I say "all but impossible,"' he adds, 'not "impossible," because the early history of Christianity is so full of the utterly unexpected, of events which a historian finds it very difficult to account for, that one can scarcely venture to say what is and what is not impossible. The inspiration of the Church worked in ways so strange that we can only follow it with open minds and bated breath.'

The conclusion, then, is this. 'A man of philosophic mind and profound genius, had been as a young man converted by the preaching of St. Paul, which teaching he never did more than modify, never gave up. Afterwards coming under the strong influence of St. John or one of his immediate followers, he heard many details of the life of Jesus, listening with ears still full of the Pauline teaching, and a heart full of the spiritual presence of the Christ of the Church. The simple narrative of the eye-witness took in his mind a new and exalted character. He was convinced that the Apostles, even the most favoured of them, did not fully comprehend the life which was unrolled before them, and accepted the teaching only as it lay on the surface, not understanding the depths which lay beneath. Often between the words of his teacher he would see an opening into great spiritual vistas. At the same time, he clearly had a deep love and profound admiration for the son of Zebedee: he realised that the relation in which he had stood to his Master consecrated him for ever. Only, his eyes had been dazzled by seeing: those who had not seen, like St. Paul and himself, were in a sense more blessed; because to the vision of faith only, and not to the eyes of the body, could the true majesty of Jesus Christ become clear.'

The first question for the Christian preacher is, 'What shall I preach?' To which the answer is, 'The Gospel.' For assuredly, if he does not preach the Gospel, he is not a Christian preacher. 'Unto you is born this day in the city of David a saviour'—that is the beginning of the Gospel. That is the very first word of Christianity. And unless he begins there we say he is not a Christian preacher.

The second question is, 'How shall I preach it?' It is a much less important question, and may receive more than one good answer. But there are especially two answers that are good. One is, 'Preach it exegetically'; the other, 'Preach it topically.'

For many a day in this land of ours the only acceptable preaching was exegetical. In the morning the portion of Scripture expounded was short; in the afternoon it was long. The short exposition was called a sermon, the long a lecture. But, long or short, sermon or lecture, it was an explanation and application of a definite passage of Scripture.

Then came a change. It was a change of the second diet of worship from the afternoon to the evening. And corresponding to that change, perhaps partly the cause of it, was the substitution of a topic for a text. The topic at first was often ethical or even political. The more it departed from the exposition of a text, the more attention it attracted. But soon the ethical or political topic became as stale, flat, and unprofitable as any of the uses of this weary world. And then the discovery was made that if the topic were taken from the Bible and well managed, it was quite as good as a text and quite as lasting in interest.

And well managed, we say. For the topic is not so easily managed as the text. It requires

more literature. It demands more knowledge of the Bible. It calls for more patience in the selection and arrangement of materials.

Then another discovery was made. While a text is better to be begun and ended in one sermon, a topic is better to run over several sermons. Each sermon should be complete in itself. But if in its completeness it is not also isolated, but gives to and receives from the sermons that surround it, the interest in it is keener and the profit of it greater. That is why a modern preacher so often chooses a great subject and bases a whole winter's course of sermons on it.

And that is why the editor of this journal has determined to issue a series of volumes on the Great Christian Doctrines. He has long recognized the unsatisfactoriness of the occasional topic as well as of the occasional text. No doubt a small topic can and must be exhausted in a single sermon. But the great topics, like the great texts, are always better than the small. Then the leap from one topic or text to another gives a wrong impression of the unity of Revelation, and probably encourages a restless habit of mind. There is the interest of the moment, perhaps; there never is the sustenance which the systematic study of the Word furnished to our fathers.

The first doctrine chosen is Prayer. It is divided into twenty chapters. Each chapter fills about twenty pages. It contains more than any man should have in a single sermon, the idea being to provide plenty of material, especially illustrative material, and leave the preacher to make his own selection.

The first chapter is introductory. It has two divisions, the Proof of Prayer, and the Practice of it. The second chapter tells what Prayer is. It is Desire; it is Communion; it is Petition. Then the five great divisions of Prayer—Adoration, Confession, Petition, Intercession, Thanksgiving—are explained each in a separate chapter, and illustrated at every step of the explanation by short pointed quotations from recent literature.

The next three chapters make known the demands of prevailing prayer. The First Principles of Prayer are 'According to the Will of God,' 'In the Name of Christ,' and 'In the Power of the Spirit.' The Personal Demands of Prayer are Knowledge, Repentance, the Three Great Graces, and Importunity. Minor Aids to Prayer are Preparation, Practice, Definiteness, Humility, Energy, Patience, Service.

The eleventh chapter meets the Scientific Objections to Prayer; the twelfth, the Philosophical. Here a striking change of emphasis is to be noticed. A generation ago the scientific objections were uppermost and almost unanswerable. To-day they do not count. The real difficulties are philosophical. They are treated in this chapter in five parts—'Our Self-sufficiency,' 'The War of Interests,' 'What is Man?', 'A Perfect Providence,' and 'The Unchangeable Will.'

The next four chapters discuss the Value of Prayer, Hindrances to Prayer, Encouragements to Prayer, and the Perplexities of Prayer, separating these carefully and keeping in close touch with experience. The Perplexities of Prayer refer to the facts that sometimes there is no answer, sometimes the answer is delayed, and sometimes it is altogether different from that which was prayed for. This introduces the whole subject of Answers to Prayer dealt with in the seventeenth chapter, which ends with a discussion of the difficult matter of spiritual communications that pass like wireless telegrams from one person to another.

With the seventeenth chapter the subject could be closed. The eighteenth gives some account of Prayers to the Persons of the Trinity. The nineteenth considers fit times for Prayer. The twentieth gathers together some interesting facts on the Manner of Prayer, and contains a short discussion of the relative value of Extempore and

Liturgical Prayer. The last section of all shows the important place that belongs to the Voice in Prayer.

From the beginning of the book to the end of it two things are kept firmly to the front. The one thing is clear arrangement and steady progress. The other is contact with reality. No desire has existed in the mind of the editor to furnish any man with a ready-made series of sermons. To get the good of the book the preacher should read the open type and make his own sermon. Then he should read the illustrations and use them as freely as he pleases.

Five lectures were delivered at the University of London in February and March on *The International Crisis in its Ethical and Psychological Aspects* (Oxford University Press; 3s. 6d. net). One of the lecturers was Professor Gilbert MURRAY, whose subject was 'Herd Instinct and the War.'

What does Professor MURRAY mean by herd instinct? He takes two paragraphs to tell us. These are the paragraphs. He says: 'At the Natural History Museum, South Kensington, close to the entrance, you can buy for the sum of fourpence a most fascinating little book on *The Fossil Remains of Man*. It is official and, I presume, authoritative. And it tells how, in very remote times, before there was any South Kensington Museum, or any England, or, I believe, in the strict sense, any Europe, there lived in swampy forests in various parts of the world, troops of little lemur-like tree-dwellers. They were, I suppose, rather like small monkeys, but much prettier. They had nice fur, good prehensile tails, and effective teeth. Then there fell upon them, or some of them, a momentous change, a hypertrophy or over-development of one part of the body. This kind of special increase, the author tells us, seldom stops till it becomes excessive. With the lemurs it was the brain which began to grow. It grew and grew, both in size and in complexity. The rest of the body suffered in consequence. The fur became mangy and disappeared. The prehensile tails wasted away. The teeth ceased to be useful as weapons. And in the end, Ladies and Gentlemen, after incalculable ages, here we are!'

'Now,' he continues, 'these lemurs had certain instincts and habits of life. Let us define our terms. By an instinct I mean, following the exposition of Dr. MCDOUGALL, an innate psychophysical disposition to notice objects of a certain class, to feel about them in certain ways and to act correspondingly. They would notice an enemy, hate him and spit at him; notice an object that was good to eat, desire it and eat it. They made love, they protected their young, they defended their group against other groups. And primitive man inherited, with modifications, their instincts, and we have similarly inherited his. Some of them were generally desirable, and are consequently admitted and encouraged; others were generally undesirable, and have been habitually denied and suppressed in our conscious life, only to break out in dreams, in fits of insanity or passion, or more subtly in self-deception. But, suppressed or unsuppressed, man's instincts form the normal motive force in his life, though the direction of that force may from time to time be controlled by conscious reason.'

But what has herd instinct to do with the war? The war has produced both good results and evil results. These results, whether good or bad, are largely due to herd instinct.

The good results are 'a greater seriousness of life, less complaining, less obvious selfishness, and more hardihood. There is a universal power of self-sacrifice whose existence we never suspected before; on every side young men are ready to go and face death for their country, and parents are ready to let them go. There is more brotherhood and more real democracy; and at the same time, a quality of which we stood in much need, far more discipline and obedience.'

The evil results are yet more evident. So evident are they that Professor MURRAY scarcely troubles to name them. He only says that reformers and idealists are disheartened, that the friends of peace, of women's causes, of legal reform, of the mitigation of cruelty to animals, are all reduced to something like impotence; and that one hears the statement made that 'there is no Christianity left.'

The herd instinct is the source of both good and bad. Not all the good that the war has brought us, nor all the bad, can be traced to it. But much of both. And it seems to Professor Gilbert MURRAY that in the highest region of all the evil is likely to predominate.

The highest region of all is religion. Now there is nothing more manifest than that the war is changing the attitude of many men to religion. Some men it is making more religious and others less. Professor MURRAY talked on different days to two soldiers in Flanders, who spoke of their feelings of terror. One said, 'It made you believe in God, I can tell you.' The other said, 'It made you doubt the existence of God.' But the most pronounced and pitiable outcome of the war is the creation of a God after the image of his creator. And this is due to the herd instinct, the instinct that seeks the preservation of the nation.

Professor MURRAY refers to Mr. DYSON'S 'finely tragic' cartoon entitled 'Alone with his God.' The Kaiser is kneeling, a devout and fully armed figure, before another Kaiser exactly the same in dress and feature, but gigantic, august, enthroned amid the incense of ruined towns and burning churches. And there is a worse thing than that.

Besides the Kaiser's God of ruined towns and burning churches is the people's God of revenge. A Danish friend has sent Dr. MURRAY a quotation from a German religious poet, 'much admired in evangelical circles.' 'We have become the nation of wrath,' says the poet; 'we accomplish the almighty will of God, and will vengefully wreak the demands of His righteousness on the godless, filled with sacred fury.'

There are few occupations more interesting or, generally speaking, more futile, than to attempt to overturn the judgment of the ages. Yet it has been done. Mary Magdalene is an example. For many centuries Mary Magdalene was identified with 'the woman that was a sinner.' No scholar makes that identification now. Whatever Christ did for her when He drove the seven devils out of her, no scholar believes now that He rescued her from a life of infamy.

In challenging the judgment of the ages it is always an advantage to be able to show when and how the ages went wrong. We can do this in the case of Mary Magdalene. When Johnson was asked by a lady about a certain definition in his Dictionary, how it was that he came to define *Pastern* as the *knee* of a horse, he at once answered, 'Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance!' The answer of those who identified Mary Magdalene with the woman that was a sinner ought to be the same. Pure ignorance! They did not know the Gospels. They did not know that the stories about Mary Magdalene which passed from mouth to mouth in their day were not contained in the Gospels, but were contradicted by the Gospels. They wanted a name for the woman that was a sinner. They did not know that the Gospels had not given her the name of Mary Magdalene. Pure ignorance, madam! And in this case the judgment of the ages has been reversed.

The judgment of the ages must be reversed in another case. It is the case of 'the woman that was a sinner.' The judgment has been that she was a woman of abandoned life. Again the verdict was given in ignorance. It is a cruel verdict. It does the woman an intolerable injustice. It will have to go.

What is the evidence? It is given by Dr. PLUMMER in his edition of *St. Luke* in the International Critical Series of Commentaries. The evidence—there are those who will be astonished to hear it—the evidence is wholly contained in the one word 'sinner.' When Dr. PLUMMER has set down the Greek word (ἁμαρτωλός) which is translated here, as elsewhere, 'sinner,' he adds this note: 'A person of notoriously bad character and probably a prostitute.'

Now there is no doubt that the woman was a sinner. Where is the woman that is not? But you go rather far if you say of every sinner, 'a person of notoriously bad character.' And when you add 'probably a prostitute,' you are guilty of an outrageous offence. Yet there is no reason why 'sinner' should be translated 'prostitute' here more than elsewhere.

It is not to the point to say, as Dr. PLUMMER does, that the word translated 'sinner' sometimes has the meaning of 'prostitute.' A euphemism is allowable always. But when it has that meaning it is made quite plain that a euphemism is in use. Dr. PLUMMER does not quote a single example in which the word itself has that meaning. It is true he bids us compare Mt 21^{32}. But when we turn to Mt 21^{32}, what do we find? Not the word 'sinner,' but the word 'prostitute' (πόρνη). The truth is that when the Bible means prostitute, it says prostitute. The text to which Dr. PLUMMER points is plain enough: 'The publicans and the harlots believed him.'

What is the reason, then, that this woman who was a sinner has been so long and so generally regarded as a prostitute? Ignorance, madam! It has not been observed (though it is convincing enough when one does observe it) that the word 'sinner' has in the Synoptic Gospels a technical meaning. It describes a certain well-defined class of the people. In our Lord's day the nation of the Jews was divided into two classes, the 'righteous' (οἱ δίκαιοι) and the 'sinners' (οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί). In saying, 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners' (Mt 9^{13}), Christ included all the people, and at the same time separated them into their two commonly recognized classes.

The division into two classes was so well known and so unhesitatingly admitted that Jesus did not need to explain. They all recognized the righteous; they all recognized the sinners. In general one might say that the righteous were those who knew the Law and endeavoured to keep it. The sinners did not know it, and for the most part did not try to keep even as much of it as they knew. What was the result? The result was contempt for the sinners on the part of the righteous and a comfortable dismissal of them to damnation. 'This people who knoweth not the law are cursed.'

And the righteous were very particular that there should be no intercourse between them and the sinners. This was their first and probably their last objection to Jesus. 'This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.' Well, one day one of the righteous class—his name was Simon—invited Jesus to dinner. While the dinner was in progress a woman who belonged to the sinner class came in and stood behind Jesus, weeping; and as she wept she wiped her tears off His feet with her hair. Simon was shocked. Not because she was a prostitute, but because she was a sinner. Had she been a prostitute he would certainly have been no more troubled than he was. It was not the degree of her sin that shocked him. It was the fact that Jesus, who was one of the righteous class, should allow a person who belonged to the class of sinners to come into close contact with Him.

The exact translation of the Greek words, according to the Revised Version, is: 'And behold, a woman which was in the city, a sinner.' That is to say, she was known in the city to belong to the sinners. The words seem to be purposely chosen to bring that out. But evidently, thought

Simon, Jesus is not aware of that. Dr. PLUMMER thinks that the city was Capernaum. It may have been, and again it may not. We do not know. But whatever city it was, Jesus would not be so well acquainted with the people as Simon, who lived in it, and whose first care it was to see that the distinction between the righteous and the sinners was maintained. Still, he argued with himself, if Jesus had been a prophet He would have known. Simon concluded that He was not a prophet. And no doubt he thought it was well worth giving the dinner to find that out.

Now if there is nothing to show that the woman was a person of evil fame, we shall henceforth give her the benefit. But is there nothing against it? There is this tremendous thing at least. When Jesus dismissed her with the blessing of forgiveness —just as he dismissed Zacchæus, who also was a sinner, and the nameless cripple who 'was borne of four'—He used these words: 'for she loved much.' It is almost incredible, but it is true, that into these words men have calmly read a reference to prostitution—as if our Lord were likely to speak of a life of lust and call it a life of love.

But there is another objection. By making this sinner a prostitute we have missed the lesson which the Evangelists wished to teach us when they selected this incident for narration. It is the lesson that it is easier for a sinner than for a righteous person to enter the Kingdom. Why is it easier? It is easier because the righteous person needs to be converted, and the sinner does not.

The righteous person needs to be converted, or, to use the better word of the Gospel, he needs to be 'born again.' In setting out to find God he has taken a wrong turning, and he has proceeded all the while along a wrong road. He has to be brought back. He has to begin again at the beginning. He has to start life anew as a little child. He has to proceed, not by counting the commandments that he keeps and the good deeds that he does, but by trusting and loving. 'Except ye turn,' said Jesus, 'and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.'

The sinner does not require to be converted. He has sinned, as the righteous man has sinned. It is most probable that he has sinned more. In the Parable of the Two Debtors, Jesus gave Simon the benefit. Simon owed fifty pence; the woman owed five hundred. But fifty pence is as sure to damn a man as five hundred if he cannot get it paid. And there is no way by which the righteous man can get it paid. He must reluctantly take down every stone of the building which he has so laboriously built and begin again, for there is a fault in its foundation. The sinner has built no building. He has simply to begin to trust and love at the point where he is now standing. A 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' if it is sincere, is all that is required of him.

There is no lesson more insistently taught in all the Gospels. Jesus taught it in many ways. Wherever He went He taught it. He used a great variety of illustrations to catch the attention and reach the heart with it. He used the illustration of the two sons, one of whom said he would go and went not, while the other said he would not go but went. He used the illustration of the other two sons, one of whom departed to a far country and spent his substance in riotous living, while the other stayed at home and served. He used the illustration of the Pharisee and the publican who went up to the temple to pray. And He used the illustration here of the two debtors, one of whom owed five hundred pence, while the other owed but fifty. It is the lesson of lessons; and in this most pathetic example of it, more pathetic even than the story of the Prodigal, we have missed its meaning in our desire to prove that the worst of sinners may be saved, the very lesson being that degree of demerit has no place in the presence of the mercy of God in Christ.

The Unrealized Christianity of Shelley.

By Eleanor Anglin Johnson, Wesley Manse, Polmont.

The other day while reading Shelley in order to tonic my mind and regain moral balance after a perusal of the daily paper, with its home-shattering columns of dead and wounded, and the pitifully inadequate mask of sanity with which it makes believe to cover the hideous and imbecile face of war, I was struck afresh and very forcibly by what might be called this poet's unconscious Christianity.

Now, as everybody knows, Shelley did not account himself, and has never been accounted by his readers, a believer in Christ, and I certainly do not wish to make out that he was one. He wrote several very strong denunciations of Christianity and 'priests' (a nomenclature meant to include all Christian preachers), and the only excuses for them are that he never met a true Christian minister, that the hypocrites he met bearing the name of Christ were infinitely less Christlike than himself, that the horrors of bloodshed and barbaric wrong which have been committed in Christ's name through the centuries roused his gentle and freedom-loving soul to strong indignation. Also he was young, barely thirty when he died, and he lived during the French Revolution. But it is only fair to add that, burning as are the words levied against Christianity, there is no word concerning Christ in all Shelley's works, prose or poetry, that is not fraught with some measure of admiration. With crude, boyish reasoning he describes Christianity as the 'established religion which war, imprisonment, assassination, and falsehood; deeds of unexampled and incomparable atrocity have made what it is,' but Jesus 'stands in the foremost list of those true heroes who have died in the glorious martyrdom of liberty, and have braved torture, contempt, and poverty in the cause of suffering humanity.' These words are in the notes of the earliest of his poems, but many proofs that all his life Shelley hated this 'established religion,' whether in the form of Protestantism or of Roman Catholicism, could be quoted from his later works. It is futile to conjecture what changes of thought would have taken place in his mind had he lived to maturity; the aim of this article is not in any way to class Shelley as a Christian poet. Nor is it its aim to try to show how nearly his ideals of character and world-order coincide with true Christian conceptions, though indeed Christ's 'Sermon on the Mount' with its beatification of meekness, purity, self-sacrifice, peace, mercy, and endurance has no more beautiful or more passionate auxiliary than Shelley's poetry. But it is not as the unchristian poet of peculiarly Christian ideals that I wish to speak of him. Strange as it may sound to some, it was as a man who has all unknowingly touched rock-bottom; who has grasped unwittingly the most fundamental of Christian truths, rather than simply as a poet of Christian ideals, that Shelley arrested my thoughts once more the other night. I might quote from several of his poems, but the most significant exposition of what I mean is found in 'Prometheus Unbound,' and I will confine myself to that.

In this splendid and all too little read drama Shelley imagines two mighty powers at strife; the one, Prometheus, typifying good, the other, Jupiter, typifying evil. The whole poem is highly imaginative, but the basic conceptions are soon given, and it is on these only that stress will be laid.

Jupiter, the usurping evil one, is omnipotent for the time being. He fills the world with woe and strife, man under his rule is at once 'despot, slave, dupe, and deceiver.' Because of his reign

> First famine, and then toil, and then disease,
> Strife, wounds and ghastly death unseen before
> Fell; and the unseasonable seasons drove
> With alternating shafts of frost and fire,
> Their shelterless, pale tribes to mountain caves;
> And in their desert hearts fierce wants he sent,
> And mad disquietudes, and shadows idle
> Of unreal good.

He sent

> Abandoned hope, and love that turns to hate;
> And self-contempt, bitterer to drink than blood;
> Pain, whose unheeded and familiar speech
> Is howling, and keen shrieks, day after day.

Surely this is only another picture of the Fall.

No more faithful account than this has been given in poetry of the ravaging work of evil in the world and in the individual heart. Prometheus, the lover of men, half-man, half-god himself, is the only one able or willing to strive with this tyrant. Neither threats nor promises move him. Jupiter

chains him to a rock and sends agonizing torments upon him. In the Greek myth these torments are merely physical, in Shelley they are such as we believe Christ suffered on Calvary. They are awful, spiritual torments such as the human mind can only dream and not realize. I know no more tremendous description of spiritual suffering in English poetry than the one in 'Prometheus Unbound' when the Furies from Jupiter attack their victim.

In this scene Prometheus has a vision of the whole weight of the world's sin; its misery, its hatred, cruelty, madness, pain, tyranny. He sees its mild and gentle heroes done to death and, what is worse, the faiths they kindled prostituted, and their gracious names cursed because of them. To me this scene has sometimes been a more forcible and understanding commentary on the words, 'He took on himself the sins of the whole world,' than Christian preachers' words on The Atonement. Had he but known, the vision of Calvary was not far from Shelley when he wrote it, for he makes his Prometheus suffer on his rock the miseries of the whole earth.

Again, he dwells on the essential thing—the *spiritual* agony undergone. The physical pain, the personal degradation are nothing.

> 'Thou thinkest we will rend thee bone from bone
> And nerve from nerve, working like fire within?'
> 'Dost imagine
> We will but laugh into thy lidless eyes?'

cry the Furies to Prometheus, but such pain is only as a drop in a deluge of agony. His real torture is incalculable:

> desperate tides of the whole great world's anguish
> Forced through the channels of a single heart.

It must be noticed further that Shelley makes this suffering fall upon Prometheus not only as a punishment for former help given to mankind, as in the Greek legend, but because he hopes through this self-effacement and sacrifice to redeem the world and make it the home of Love.

A beautiful chorus of gracious spirits follows this awful scene, a chorus of hope and triumph such as wise angels might have sung when Christ died on the Cross and His disciples mourned disconsolate. Here is a small part of it:

Chorus. Tho' Ruin now Love's shadow be,
Following him, destroyingly,
On Death's white and winged steed,
Which the fleetest cannot flee,
Trampling down both flower and weed,
Man and beast, and foul and fair,
Like a tempest thro' the air;
Thou shalt quell this horseman grim,
Woundless though in heart and limb.

Prometheus. Spirits, how know ye this shall be?

Chorus. In the atmosphere we breathe,
As buds grow red when the snow-storms flee,
From spring gathering up beneath,
Whose wild winds shake the elder brake,
And the wandering herdsmen know
That the whitethorn soon will blow:
Wisdom, Justice, Love, and Peace,
When they struggle to increase,
Are to us as soft winds be
To shepherd boys, *the prophecy*
That begins and ends in Thee.

This, then, is the first thing I claim for Shelley: he realized, though only in thought and unconnected with the fact of Christ, two fundamentals of our religion. He realized that in the world is evil so strong and regnant that mere man is helpless against it, and further that some Being in whom Power and Love are united must suffer with infinite meekness and self-sacrifice for the redemption of mankind. We read in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians concerning the meek sacrifice of Christ, 'He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death,'—in order to kill sin in the hearts of men. A Christian poet whose lines are continually quoted as interpretations of Scripture words the vision of David concerning Christ's sacrifice thus:

> He who did most shall bear most: the strongest shall
> stand the most weak.
> 'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for, my flesh that
> I seek
> In the Godhead. I seek it and find it. . . .

Shelley's conception of a Redeemer is identical with these:

> Resist not the weakness;
> Such strength is in meekness
> That the Eternal, the Immortal,
> Must unloose thro' life's portal
> The snakelike Doom coiled underneath his throne
> *By that alone.*

Secondly, I wish to notice briefly, for this is not so startlingly surprising as the ideas already referred to—Shelley's immovable belief in the ultimate reign of good through sacrifice. Jupiter

—Evil—may reign now, but he is by nature subject: 'All spirits are enslaved which serve things evil.' What is the poet's conception of a redeemed world? What is the result of Prometheus's wisdom, courage, and long-suffering love? Simply it is this:

> All things had put their evil nature off.

As it was Shelley's, it is the Christian hope also; Love is to rule the world, and Love alone. The world of men, he tells us in the last triumphant scene of the play, will still have labour and grief to fight against, but

> Familiar acts are beautiful through Love;
> Labour and pain and grief in life's green grove
> Sport like tame beasts, none knew how gentle they could be.

War, oppression, hate, revenge and all the evils which have been born of sin disappear. Mankind is addressed thus:

> Man, who wert once a despot and a slave;
> A dupe and a deceiver; a decay;
> A traveller from the cradle to the grave
> Through the dim light of this immortal day;
> . . . . . .
> Love, from its awful throne of patient power
> In the wise heart, from the last giddy hour
> Of dead endurance, from the slippery, steep,
> And narrow verge of craglike agony, springs
> And folds over the world its healing wings.

The world is saved by and shall become the home of Love.

. . . . . .

Instead of Prometheus, Shelley could in his great drama have made Christ his hero without changing the *fundamental* argument of the poem: for that argument is nothing less nor more than the spectacle of Good unsubdued by Evil, the supreme Goodness suffering, in love and power, untold agony for the redemption of man and the triumph of Love. The author of this drama is one of that spiritual company who have unknowingly clasped Christ's hand and looked into His heart of Love and Strength.

The Niffer Story of the Creation and the Flood.

By Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., London.

In June 1913, Dr. Arno Poebel gave, in the University of Pennsylvania *Museum Journal*, an account of the Creation and the Flood as current about 2000 years B.C. at the Babylonian city of Niffer, which is identified with the Calneh of Gn 10^9. This was merely a preliminary outline of the record which, owing to the enterprise and generosity of the subscribers of the fund for excavations in Babylonia, had been acquired by the intermediary of Professor H. V. Hilprecht, for the Pennsylvania University Museum. The document in question forms one of those excavated between the years 1888 and 1900, of which about 10,000 were unpacked in 1910.

The tablet is described as measuring $5\frac{5}{8}$ inches high by 7 inches wide. About a third of the document is preserved, which would make the original height to have been 12 or 14 inches. Each side has three columns of writing, now in part somewhat defaced and mutilated, but originally very clear and distinct. As it is the lower part of the obverse and the upper part of the reverse which has been preserved, the beginning and the end are wanting. The 2nd and 3rd columns are separated by a wide gap, but the text of the 3rd column is immediately followed by that of the 4th. In their present mutilated state, however, it cannot be said that their connexion is very satisfactory. The 4th, 5th, and 6th columns, like the 2nd and 3rd, are also separated from each other by a wide gap.

Where the text opens—about two-thirds down the 1st column—some divine personage is speaking—probably the deity associated with Nintu(r), the great mother-goddess, in the work of creation.

2. 'Let us [restore?] my mankind on their destruction—
3–4. Nin-tu(r), let us restore my creation. . . .
5. Let us return the people into their settlements,
6. Let them rebuild their cities,
7. let them unite under their (the gods') protection.

8. Let them lay the brickwork of (the gods') houses in a pure place,
9. Our vessels in a pure place let them shape.'
10. With holy fire the foundation he made straight,
11. The sublime law he perfected there.
12. Where he spoke, he made the decree.
13. After Ana, Enlilla, Enki, Nin-ḫursagga
14. Had created the black-headed ones (man),
15. The root (?) of the ground in the ground he set,
16. The four-limbed animals of the plain
17. meetly he produced.

COLUMN 2.

(About two-thirds wanting.)

Apparently some divine personage is again speaking, and there is a reference to looking upon some one—probably the creator of all things. The text then goes on:

8. . . . the creator of the land . . .
9. The . . . of royalty he brought forth—
10. He brought forth the sublime . . ., the seat of royalty
11. He perfected the [sub]lime [commands].
12. [In holy places 5] ci[ties h]e founded—
13. He procl[aimed] their names, he allotted them to rulers.
14–15. The central city, Êridu, the chief Nîdum-mud founded;
16. The second, the *tunugira*, the fortification of Kis, he founded;
17. The third, Larak (Larancha), Pa-pil-ḫursag founded;
18. The fourth, Zimbir (Sippar), Utu (the sun-god) founded;
19. The fifth, Šuruppak, Sukurrura (or Šurup-pak) founded.
20. These cities he proclaimed by name—
21. he appointed to a commander.
22. He dug the watercourses, made plentiful the rains, and set water therein;
23. He made the small rivers, their branches, producing plenty (?).

COLUMN 3.

(About two-thirds lost, much defaced where the text opens, and the ends of the lines in some cases wanting.)

Poebel sees in the much-defaced 11th line, at the beginning, the word *uku*, 'people,' and at the beginning of the 12th *ameru*, 'a rainstorm.' In the 14th line 'they' seem to have 'made' something. The text then continues:

15. At that time Nin-tu [*screamed*] like [a *woman in travail*[1]];
16. The holy Ištar wailed on account of her people;
17. Enki took counsel with his own heart.
18. Anu, Enlilla, Enki, Ninḫursagga, . . .
19. The gods of heaven and earth, in[voked] the name of Ana-Enlilla.
20. At that time Zi-û-sudu the king (was) the anointing priest of . . .
21. A great AN-SAG[2] he made . . .
22. In solitude giving voice, in reverence . . .
23. Daily patiently standing . . .
24. Producing (things which) were not dreams, a response (?) . . .
25. Invoking the name of heaven and earth . . .

COLUMN 4.

1. For the enclosure (?) the gods . . . a wall (?);
2. Zi-û-sudu, standing at its side, heard (?)
3. 'By the support (on) my left hand, stand;
4. 'By the support I will speak a word to thee . . .
5. 'My holy one, thine ear [to me incline].
6. 'At our hands a water-flood upon the comman[ders]
7. will [be sent],
8. 'To destroy the seed of mankind . . .
9. 'the decision is the pronouncement of the assembly [of the gods] . . .
10. 'The command of Ana-Enlilla . . .
11. 'His kingdom, his rule . . .'
12. To him (?) . . .
13. In his . . . he . . .

(The remainder of the column, about two-thirds, is wanting.)

COLUMN 5.

1. All the powerful wind-storms as one rushed forth

[1] Such is Poebel's suggested restoration.

[2] Such is the ideographic writing, but it may have been pronounced *saggar* or *dunga*. This latter word is a synonym of *lumḫa*, and both apparently stand for musical instruments of some kind. Cf. the next line.

2. A water-flood over[1] the [hostile] raged.
3. For 7 days and 7 nights,
4. After the water-flood had raged over the land,
5. The mighty boat had been wind-driven over the swollen waters,
6. Utu (the sun-god) came forth again, on heaven and earth making day.
7. Zi-û-sudu opened a window (?) of the mighty boat—
8. The hero Utu makes his light to enter into the mighty boat.
9. Zi-û-sudu the king
10. In the presence of Utu prostrated himself.
11. The king sacrifices an ox, slaughters a sheep,
12. Whilst (?) . . . the great horn . . .
13. . . . he . . . s for him
14. . . .
15. . . . filled it
16. . . . doubled.
17. . . .

(The remainder, about two-thirds of the column, is wanting.)

COLUMN 6.

1. By the soul of heaven, by the soul of earth, ye shall conjure him.
2. that he may be well-disposed with you.'
3. Ana-Enlilla conjured they by the soul of heaven and the soul of earth,
4. and he was well-disposed with them.
5. The root (?) growing from the earth they took up (?).
6. Zi-û-sudu the king
7. Prostrated himself before Ana-Enlilla.
8. Life like a god he gives him—
9. Eternal life like a god he confers upon him.
10. At that time Zi-û-sudu the king
11. Called the name of the root (?) 'seed of mankind'—
12. In another land, the land of Tilmun . . . they made it live.
13. After they had made it live . . .

The remainder of the column—more than two-thirds—is wanting, except that on the left-hand edge of the tablet is a defaced line, in which the editor sees again the name of Zi-û-sudu. From its position, and the ruled line which precedes it, it seems as though it ought to be inserted between lines 7 and 8 of column 6, from which it had apparently been, by error, omitted.

[1] Or 'against.'

Mutilated though it is, it will easily be recognized that this text is a document of considerable importance. Though written in Sumerian, and exceedingly defective, there is still sufficient that is certain in the record to enable a comparison with the other known Babylonian versions of the Creation and the Flood to be made. In the 11th tablet of the Gilgameš series the great mother-goddess, who laments over the destruction of mankind, whom she had created, is Maḫ, 'the lady of the gods,' Merodach's spouse, also called Nin-tu, 'the lady of reproduction,' and Nin-ḫursaga, 'the lady of the mountain,' so that the two are in complete accord here. From the opening lines of the 1st column, however, it would seem as though the gods, at the time they, with the help of the goddess, created man and the 'four-limbed beasts of the plain,' had foreseen the advent of the Flood at a later date, and had provided for the revivification of the human race, by placing in the ground the thing which I have doubtfully rendered 'root,' which, later on, the Babylonian Noah, here called Zi-û-sudu, named 'the seed of mankind.'

Apparently time passed on, and men increased both in numbers and in the things which interest and make life worth living. Under the gods, royalty had been instituted with all its pomp and circumstance, as understood in those days, and the sublime commands—of the gods, as we may imagine—had been communicated to men. At this early period five holy cities existed, and were given to rulers whose names do not always appear. The list of cities, however, is interesting, as it includes Êridu (which seems to have been regarded as earth's 'central point,' hence the name applied to it), and a place called 'the fortification of Kis,' which lay about 18 miles N. of Hillah, the modern village representative of ancient Babylon. One would imagine, therefore, that the composer of this poem—for such it is—began by mentioning the most important points in the extreme south and in the north. The third city, Larancha, was probably on the Euphrates, but its site has yet to be identified. The fourth, Sippar, was also in the N., and the fifth, Šuruppak, is the modern Fara, celebrated of old because it was the birthplace or at least the residence of the Babylonian Noah. The Biblical cities, Babel, Erech, Accad, and

Calneh (Gn 10^9) are entirely wanting. The column ends with the statement that the creating deity provided water-channels for the irrigation of the land, and rain and other water wherewith to fill them.

In the 3rd column we have the account of the great catastrophe of the Flood. In the opening lines the grief of the mother-goddess Nin-tu is strikingly referred to. The completion, making line 15 to state that at that time the goddess 'screamed like a woman in travail,' is that of Poebel, and is based upon the corresponding lines in the Flood story belonging to the 11th tablet of the Gilgameš series, where it is stated that 'Ištar called out like a women in travail,' and Maḫ, otherwise 'the lady of the gods,' made her voice resound (*Išissi Ištar kima ilidti, unambi Maḫ ṭâbat rigma*, obv. col. iii. 11. 7, 8). As in the Gilgameš version, Enki or Êa seeks how he may warn mankind of their impending doom, and save at least a few, and he joins with Anu, Enlilla, and the goddess Nin-ḫursagga in invoking the name of Ana-Enlilla, the divine ancestor of Merodach, whose name, as far as the record is preserved, does not occur. It is here that we come across the name of the Babylonian Noah, which is given in Sumerian as Zi-û-sudu, the Sisuthes of Lucian. It will be remembered that his name, in the Gilgameš legend, appears as Ut-napišti^{m}, apparently meaning 'day of life,' and the form in this new version in part agrees with this, as its component parts mean 'life-day-long-abiding,' apparently referring to the gift of immortality conferred on the patriarch after the Flood, when the deity led him forth from the ark.

The lines which follow the first reference to the Babylonian Noah are too mutilated to be entirely satisfactory in their signification, especially as we are unaided by any Semitic translation. Lines 22 to 25, however, are noteworthy as showing (should their rendering be correct) the character of Zi-û-sudu—piety, reverence, patience, the god's favour in his dreams, conferring the gift of prophecy, and power with the deity owing to his knowledge of invocations and charms. Have we, by chance, in this the key to the meaning of the Biblical name Noah as 'the patient one'? Further discoveries will probably throw light upon this point.

'Life-day-long-remaining,' 'resting,' 'patience,' —all these things seem to go well together, and Zimmern has pointed out to Poebel a very noteworthy variant in *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, xviii. pl. 30, where, in the left-hand double column, we find that the fourth section is headed by *Zi-suda*, 'extended life,' explained by *Ut-na*-PAP-ḪAL-*te*, apparently a fanciful writing of *Ut-na-pa-aš-te*, in which we have a variant of *Ut-napišti^{m}* (*-napešti*) with the same meaning, 'day of life.' The Babylonian Noah was the patient one, waiting for the 'day of life,' and the 'day of extended life.' He was also Athra-ḫasis, 'the exceedingly wise,' learned in the wisdom of the gods by his patience, 'daily patiently standing' before his god Enki or Êa (Cronos), to learn his will, and the things which were to be upon the earth.

In column 4 the opening lines are very uncertain as to their interpretation, but it seems probable that it is the record of a revelation to Zi-û-sudu, and, as far as it is preserved, it announces the coming of the Flood, and states the name of the deity responsible for it, namely, Ana-Enlilla. In column 5 the coming of the catastrophe is described —the windstorms and the Flood which followed them, and which was apparently directed against or upon the commanders of the cities already referred to. These, it may, perhaps, be supposed, were the sinners against the gods, who, leading their people astray, brought upon them the wrath which was the cause of the infliction. As in the 11th tablet of the Gilgameš series, the Flood lasted seven days and seven nights, and then the sun shone forth again, and its rays entered into the great wind-driven boat. The name given to the parallel to the Biblical ark is noteworthy on account of the adjective added to it—it is not merely ^{giš} *ma* = *êlippu*, 'the ship,' but ^{giš} *ma-gurgur*, 'the great great ship.' This same word occurs in the fragment of another Semitic Babylonian version published by Hilprecht (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1910, p. 366), where it occurs under the form ^{ĝiš} *ma-gurgur-ru^{m}*, translated by the discoverer of the fragment by 'house-boat.' The same text also calls it ^{ĝiš} *êlippu^{m} rabêtu^{m}*, 'great ship,' 'boat.'

The sun's rays shone in in consequence of Zi-û-sudu opening something—a window, porthole, or the like. In this rendering I have been influenced by the version in the Gilgameš series, in which, however, a very natural human—and humanitarian —trait is introduced, namely, the patriarch king's grief at seeing the waste of waters and the destruction of mankind which had been wrought. This seems

to be absent in the older Sumerian version now described. The narrative at this point speaks of his prostrating himself (apparently in adoration of the king of light), and the sacrifices which he proceeded to make. Here an ox and a sheep replace the vegetable offerings of the Flood-hero whom Gilgameš journeyed so far to see.

There remains only the 6th and last column, as far as it is preserved. A deity apparently urges them (Zi-û-sudu, his wife, and all those who were with him in the 'mighty boat') to conjure the sender of the Flood, Ana-Enlilla, that he should be well-disposed towards them. This he does, and Zi-û-sudu receives life—eternal life—like that of a god. After this comes a reference to the things which I have rendered 'roots,' growing in the ground. These the patriarch-king seems to have called 'the seed of mankind,' and they were made to live—how is not stated—in another land, apparently the district called Tilmun, on the shores of the Persian Gulf—practically south and south-western Babylonia, with, possibly, the island of Bahrein, if we accept Oppert's identification.

In the Study.

An Induction Sermon.

By the Rev. A. F. Taylor, M.A., St. Cyrus.

'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers: and thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it.'—Is $30^{20.21}$.

We are met here on an occasion of very special local interest—the induction of a new pastor over his congregation—but there broods upon all our minds to-day the shadow of a great European crisis and a great national anxiety. I have not found it easy to find a text that should be in harmony with both the particular and the general situation. I have finally selected the verse which I have read to you from the thirtieth chapter of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah.

The prophet Isaiah was a master of phrases. His style is full of vigorous contrasts—contrasts of sound, contrasts of words, contrasts of thought. Contrasts of sound and contrasts of words can scarcely be reproduced in a translation, but contrasts of thought remain in whatsoever language they are rendered, and we have such a contrast of thoughts in this particular text. 'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed.' The text sets two things in contrast to one another, and represents the one as in some measure a compensation for the other—and some people may think it a very inadequate compensation. The words have the appearance and promise of comfort, but the comfort is of a somewhat elusive kind. One can understand the comfort of such words as, I will give you deliverance from your enemies, or relief from your suffering, or rest from your fear; or even of the Apostle Paul's assurance that the afflictions and troubles of this present life will find an adequate compensation in the joy and glory of the life to come. But this surely is strange comfort anyway, 'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers (or preachers) be removed.'

I would have you note, first, the vigorous nature of the metaphor. *Bread* and *water* are the daily necessaries of life. It is almost as if the prophet had said, 'Though adversity and affliction be with you every day of your lives, so that you seem almost to feed on them, yet you need not be discouraged. There is compensation; and the compensation is this, that your teachers, or preachers, will still be with you.' Curiously enough, the prophet Amos uses the same metaphor, and the same contrast of thought, but in a different way—as embodying not a message of comfort, but a message of warning. 'Behold,' he says, 'I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but a famine of hearing the words of the Lord . . . and they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it.' It is just as if he had said, There are worse things that can happen to a people even than the terror of famine, and that is, that they should not be able to hear any word of the Lord for the comfort and strengthening of their souls. So here the prophet says, Even in

the midst of national anxiety, peril, and disaster, no people need despair if there are still among them those who can speak some message of God to their souls. Of course there are some people to whom this word-promise will not appeal. That which the word specifies as one of the good and gracious things which may sustain the national life in the midst of adversity will not appear to them to be any great comfort or any adequate compensation. But just herein lies the freshness and boldness of the metaphor. Who but a man of genius, who but a man who was conscious of the moral momentum and persuasiveness he was able to put into his words, would have dared to offer the people such an apparently illusive comfort as this? 'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy preachers be removed.' 'Poor comfort!' one may say, 'for who are my preachers? and what help worth speaking of can they give me in the time of trouble? "The heart knoweth its own bitterness; and a stranger intermeddleth not with its joy." I must eat the bread of adversity alone, and I must drink the water of affliction alone. Money may help me if I am poor; a strong arm may help me if I am in peril; a physician may help me in the hour of sickness, but what can the preacher do for me anyway? Will words discharge my debt, or frighten my foe, or heal me of my sickness? How are these two things to come into touch with one another —poverty and peril and sickness, so real and so pungent, and on the other side words — mere words! Miserable comforters are ye all!'

And yet there is a deep, an abiding, and a marvellous truth in this message of the prophet; for, after all, the spiritual compensations of life are the only adequate ones, for through them, however the body may suffer, the soul still triumphs!

Of course the difficulty of realizing the full comfort of this message lies in the fact that the actual or professional teacher, or preacher, falls often so far short of the ideal. After all, there are but few preachers who actually *are* all that the ideal preacher has it in him to be. One or two great lights there are in every generation, whether we call them prophets, philosophers, or poets; some lesser lights that may still be accounted great; lesser still in diminishing degree until we come down to those whose light is so feeble that it is almost a mockery to call them lights, forces, or powers at all. The greater lights are men whose names will live for ever—Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Apostle Paul, Wycliffe and Luther, Knox and Wesley and Chalmers; the lesser lights are the ephemerally popular preachers, serviceable in their own day and generation, but not remembered beyond it; and so down by degrees we come to those who are still preachers in name, but in whose voices there is no ring of conviction, in whose thoughts there is no light, in whose message there is no power to comfort or inspire. I speak feelingly, as every preacher must who is conscious how far his own actual service falls below the ideal.

'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed'—a high ideal of the preacher's office lies behind these words, and it is only if we turn our thoughts away from the actual and professional preacher, and fix them on the preacher God-given and God-endowed, that we feel the full truth of them. But what an inestimable boon such a God-given and God-endowed teacher is! How he grips his generation and lifts it out of lethargy and despair! How he arouses men to new efforts, and awakens them to new interests, and imparts fresh zest to their lives! He *is* some compensation to a people in the time of their adversity and affliction, for it is just in such times that he comes to his own, and often enough he transforms a nation's adversity and affliction into glory and honour. It is almost impossible to overstate what one man may be to the generation to whom God has sent him. No greater boon can come to any nation than that there should be ever with them some man of God to strengthen them in adversity or guide their counsels in the time of peace!

Such a man was the prophet Isaiah himself. Those were days of terrible anxiety in Jerusalem when he lived, and had it not been for him they might have been days of terrible disaster also. Had it not been for Isaiah the fate of Jerusalem might have been like that of Samaria, which, crushed by the might of Assyria, never again raised its head. Such men also were Wycliffe and Luther, Knox and Wesley and Chalmers. The ideal preacher is a captain and leader of men, moulder of their thoughts and inspirer of their feelings, from which all their actions spring. He may not immediately and literally be able to deliver a people from their adversity. He cannot blow away an

army like the legendary Elisha; but he can stand by a people in the midst of their adversity, delivering them from cowardice, inspiring them with courage, confidence, and hope. Adversity and affliction are very sore experiences of life, but, if they should befall us, it is much indeed if we may be strengthened and inspired to bear them manfully and go bravely through with the work of life in spite of them.

There are thousands of young men everywhere crying for some one to teach them, to be the master of their thoughts, and to lead them in the ways of the higher and nobler life. Let but the true God-given and God-endowed preacher appear, and choice souls will gather round him, be they few or many; and it is a wonderful thing indeed that even those who can lay no claim to exceptional gifts of learning, eloquence, or force are yet permitted to bear their part in this great ministry of comfort and inspiration. If we ministers have felt discouraged sometimes by the thought of how little we seem to be able to help or influence those round about us, have we not also been surprised sometimes to know that some word of ours has indeed brought strength or comfort to a frail or suffering soul?

Let me close with a word of comfort to my brethren in the ministry. Knowing what I myself have felt, I know what you have felt also. I know that many of you, my brethren, have often felt discouraged and sometimes, perhaps, even depressed. You know, indeed, that you have a message, but often enough utterance seems to be denied you—at least such utterance, powerful and persuasive, as you would wish to achieve. Let me then remind you that things are to be valued according to their nature, not merely according to their magnitude. Whatever raised to its highest power is manifestly able to exert an *enormous* influence, must be able to exercise *some* influence even at its lowest power. The sun illuminates the whole solar system, but that very fact implies that a candle flame may illuminate a room. We must not allow ourselves to think or feel that our ministry or service is of no account because it is not of as great account as we should wish it to be, or as some other man's apparently is.

At the beginning of the complete edition of Wordsworth's poems (at least of my edition) there stands as preface to the whole a Sonnet in which I myself have often found comfort and which, with the omission of a single word, I hand on to you:

> If thou indeed derive thy light from Heaven,
> Then, to the measure of that heaven-born light,
> Shine—in thy place, and be content:—
> The stars pre-eminent in magnitude,
> And they that from the zenith dart their beams,
> (Visible though they be to half the earth,
> Though half a sphere be conscious of their brightness)
> Are yet of no diviner origin,
> No purer essence, than the one that burns,
> Like an untended watchfire, on the ridge
> Of some dark mountain; or than those which seem
> Humbly to hang, like twinkling winter lamps,
> Among the branches of the leafless trees;
> All are the undying offspring of one Sire:
> Then, to the measure of the light vouchsafed,
> Shine—in thy place, and be content!

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

August.

'Behold a basket of summer fruit.'—Am 8[1].

If any of you children chanced to go to Ayrshire in the summer-time, and found yourselves near a place called Alloway, you would meet tourists from all over the world, and see them, not only lingering by the banks of the river Doon, but trying to get a glimpse of a real Scottish ploughman. The explanation of this is, that there was once a ploughman lived in the neighbourhood whose name was Robert Burns. He was a man who had visions. He could not even see a wild daisy growing without dreaming about it, and his mind becoming filled with beautiful thoughts. When he wrote these thoughts down, they seemed just full of music. Ever since his death, people have spoken of Robert Burns as the greatest of Scottish poets. Then France had a wonderful painter called Millet. He also came of humble peasant folk, and his pictures make one feel sure that there must be something pure and lovely about the character of the French peasantry.

Sometimes I think that town children miss a great deal by not coming more into contact with the people who live always in the country and whose men-folk plough the fields and take care of the sheep; their lives are so full of interest, and they themselves often so good. The Prophet Amos was just a farm labourer. According to his own description he was a herdsman and a

dresser of sycamore trees, which means that he tended the sheep and the goats and took care of the sycamore fruit. In the course of his day's work, he naturally had many opportunities of learning nature's secrets and hearing God speak. One day there came to him the command of the Lord to go and tell the people of Israel about their sins. And Amos went. Think of this plain man of the hills appearing amongst those who thought themselves very great and also very 'grand.' Amos, the herdsman, might seem rugged and uncouth, but you may be sure that his straight simple words arrested the attention of his listeners.

He took pictures from his outdoor life to enforce his arguments. Once a vision came to him: 'A basket of summer fruit.' That sounds nice, doesn't it? I know that the thoughts of you boys and girls turn at once to strawberries, raspberries, and plums that have a beautiful fresh bloom upon them. But to Amos this vision did not speak of the lusciousness of ripe summer fruit, but of its decay. Probably there appeared to him just the common fruit amongst which he worked every day during the whole fruit season—the fig of the sycamore tree. It was one of those fruits that have to be eaten as soon as they are plucked. You know how soon even strawberries and raspberries lose their flavour when off the bushes.

The sycamore fig of Palestine was a most peculiar growth. An interesting writer and preacher tells us that it grew, not from the branches, but from the trunk of the tree, and on short stems. In order to produce this fruit, the part of the tree where it budded required to have a cut or wound made in it. From this wound or opening a bud sprang up, which grew and formed the fruit. Then when the fruit was nearly ripe, it required to be punctured, or to have what is called its 'eye' removed, for the fig was infested with an insect that gave it a bad taste. When the 'eye' or top was cut off, the insect escaped and the fruit then became sweet. Now, boys and girls, try to remember that the sycamore fig originated in a wound, and was made sweet by a wound. It was altogether an unnatural growth.

The vision of the ripe sycamore figs brought to Amos a message of judgment for Israel. It is right that your dream of 'a basket of summer fruit' should bring only thoughts of joy. God meant it to be so. For those of you who cannot have baskets of strawberries or raspberries He has made a lovely fruit garden. It is out in the country, in the woods, and by the waysides. With some children I have known, summer reached its fullest glory only when there came a day of gathering ripe wild fruit. You love colour, I know. You like the field flowers. But what happiness is to be compared with that of spending a day in the woods, or of wandering for hours amongst hedgerows, and at night going home with baskets full of Nature's good things? You don't all carry baskets, I know. I have met many a merry party returning from gathering blaeberries. The shy, happy smile, the little black mouths, and the flagons told me what they had been about.

Last month, walking through a wood, I noticed the blaeberries ripening, and I could not help thinking of God's goodness. The bushes grew amidst the softest of mossy carpets, and little flowers peeped up here and there, as if laughing to see a grown person trying to find a ripe blaeberry in early July. I was trespassing in the children's garden. Whatever be the sorrows in the world, God does not forget you, my boys and girls. He gives you many things to make you happy, amongst them the 'basket of summer fruit.'

When Amos delivered his terrible message, he was looking back over the story of a nation that had sinned. You are looking forward. Your 'basket of summer fruit'—does it speak to you of anything beyond the mere joy of eating it?

Many years ago, a girl went blaeberrying with her brother. The wood was a long way from where they lived, and a schoolboy companion asked them to go to his home for tea. This boy's father was a crofter. What a quaint old house the girl was taken to. She looked up and saw the rafters in the kitchen. They were quite black. At first, she wondered if she could enjoy her tea. Of course she did, and that very much. Afterwards, quite a number of people came into the kitchen, and seated themselves in a circle. Bibles were handed round, then a psalm was sung to a very old-fashioned tune. After that came a chapter from the Bible—read verse about. Some of the readers read like little children: you know what I mean. Lastly, they all knelt down and an old grandfather prayed.

On the way home, the girl felt that her day at 'the blaeberries' had somehow not been quite so full of fun as usual. Now, when she is old and has forgotten the sweetness of the wild fruit, she

looks back on that Saturday as one of the happiest in her life. There was sunshine, there were flowers; and her visit to the crofter's cottage made her think of God. The sycamore fruit was an unnatural growth: so too was the wickedness of Israel. They were God's children and had forgotten it; thus their happiness and prosperity could —like the sweetness of the figs—endure only for a moment. Take then your 'basket of summer fruit,' my boys and girls, with God's blessing. Remember you are His children, and that He is caring for you. His goodness 'endureth for ever.'

II.

Like to Like.

'And being let go, they went to their own company.'—Ac 4^{23} (A.V.).

Who were the men who 'went to their own company'? They were Peter and John, the disciples of Jesus. Peter, who was accompanied by John, had healed a lame man who lay at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, and the event had caused great excitement among the people. Now you know what happens in our own towns when anything unusual occurs — a big crowd gathers. It was just the same in Jerusalem. The people ran together to see what was the matter, and I wouldn't be a bit surprised to learn that there were a very great number of small boys in that crowd. Peter began to speak to the people about how they had crucified Christ and how He had risen again, and many of them were won over to the side of Jesus. But when the priests heard about it, they were very much alarmed, so they shut up Peter and John in prison for the night. The following morning the rulers and elders and scribes had Peter and John brought into their midst, and they tried to get them to promise not to speak any more to the people. But when the disciples refused to do this, the council, after threatening them, let them go, for they were afraid of the people. And, Peter and John being let go, 'went to their own company.'

Who were the companions to whom Peter and John went? They were also disciples of Jesus, and the next few verses let us see what kind of men they were. They were good men, and they were brave men, praying that they might still have boldness to speak the word in spite of the threats that had been made.

Do you know that if we had learned nothing more about Peter and John than what is told us in our text, and what we read about the company to which they joined themselves, we could still have told what kind of men they were. Now I wonder how that is? Well, it's just like this. Men and women, boys and girls, too, are known by the company they choose, when they are free to choose. If we had been told what kind of company Peter and John had in prison, we wouldn't have known a bit more what kind of men they were themselves. Very likely they had beside them robbers and murderers, but that didn't mean that *they* were robbers and murderers. Their companions were chosen for them. But as soon as they were free they went to the companions they had chosen themselves, and people do not choose companions unless they like them and have something in common with them.

You will find that you are judged by the company you keep, by the friends you choose. Have you ever heard the story of the farmer who had a pet parrot? One day he lost his parrot. Search was made everywhere but Polly could not be found. A few days later the farmer set out to shoot some crows who were damaging his crops. He hid himself behind a hedge and took aim, and then went to see how many crows had been killed. Lying beside the dead crows he found his favourite parrot, one wing broken by the shot. And when he picked it up, what do you think it said? 'Bad company; bad company!'

Yes, it was bad company that had brought Polly to this sad pass; and remember, if you are found amongst the crows, you will be taken for a crow; if you company with bad boys and girls, you will be thought to be one of them.

Now if somebody were to come to me and ask me about one of you, 'What kind of boy is that?' or, 'What do you think of that girl?' I should say to them, 'Will you give me a few days to find out, and then I will tell you?' Of course I should have to put on a sort of invisible cap, because if you knew I were watching you, you would be a different kind of boy or girl—not the real boy or girl. Well, suppose I had on my invisible cap and set out to watch you, where do you think I should go? Perhaps you imagine I should follow you into school and stand behind your form, or sit on your desk to see how you did your lessons. Oh dear no, I shouldn't think of wasting time

over that. I should know that while you are in school you have to keep to certain rules and do certain things—you are just one of a crowd who have to keep these same rules and do these same things. So while you were in school I should take a little nap to prepare me for the hard work I should have later on.

But when school hours were over, when you were 'let go,' I should stand beside the door and watch you coming out; I should follow you to the playground and notice what kind of games you played, and how you played them. I should notice what sort of temper you showed at games, whether you played fair, and whether you gave the other boy credit for playing fair. I should follow you on the way home. I should notice the groups you broke up into—who were your chums. Then when your lessons were learned in the evening and your books put away, I should watch how you employed your spare time.

Here is a boy or girl who makes for a book and sits down to devour it quite oblivious of all that is going on around. It is not difficult to tell what sort of young people they are. Here are others who get out their cricket bat or their tennis racquet—they are fond of games. Here is a boy who gets hold of his tools and starts whittling and hammering at something. He has a taste for engineering. Here is a girl who likes to bake things or sew things. She is going to be a good housewife. Here is another girl who gets out her paint-box and her pencil. She has a love for art. Here is a boy who goes out and hangs about the street idle. He is in danger of getting into serious mischief and making a mess of his life. Here is a girl who is *so* tired of everything, and thinks there is nothing nice to do. She is laying the foundations of an unhappy nature, and if she doesn't pull herself together, she will turn out a bore to herself and her friends.

Yes, it isn't how we behave when we are being watched and held in that shows what we really are: it is the company we choose when we are free—the company of things and of people: it is the way we act when nobody is watching. Are we just as straight and upright behind our mothers' and fathers' backs as we would be if they were looking on?

There is a story of an American statesman who lost his wife, and on her tombstone he had these words carved: 'Sacred to the memory of Jocelyn, wife of J. Sterling Morton and mother of Paul, Mark, and Joy Morton.' One day a friend who had seen the tombstone remarked on the strangeness of the inscription, and asked Mr. Morton why he had had the boys' names put there. And what do you think the statesman replied? 'I have taken my boys to see the tombstone, and I have told them that if one of them does anything to dishonour his mother's memory I will have that one's name chiselled off the stone.' I think those boys would be very careful always to be honourable, and clean, and true. I think they would be anxious never to do anything mean or unworthy. And I think it is a splendid rule for all of us, whether they are with us still, or whether they are waiting for us in our Home above—never to do anything, anywhere, of which our mothers would be ashamed.

III.

The Enchantment of Sin.

'Ye will not come to me that ye may have life.'—Jn 5^{40}.

In the book called *The Faerie Queene* is told the tale of the quest of Sir Guyon. The story tells that the Faerie Queen had a feast every year for twelve days. All her brave knights were in attendance at the court, and people who had suffered any injury came and begged for help against the wicked fairies or witches, or dragons who had done them harm, and the Faerie Queen sent her knights to redress their wrongs, to slay the dragon, or the magician, or whatever else was needed. At one of these feasts an old palmer appeared. He was dressed in black, and carried a long staff in his hand. He had come to complain of the doings of a wicked witch called Acrasia, who did many evil things in his country. There was at the feast a brave handsome knight, named Guyon, and to him the Queen gave the task of going with the palmer, to save his country from the enchantress. So they set out together, and met with many adventures by the way. They came to a sea which they had to cross, and got a boat and a boatman to take them over. For some days they rowed on past great sea monsters, and enchanted islands, and at last they drew near to the land where Acrasia lived. Then Guyon got his arms ready; and as soon as they touched the shore, he took the palmer with him as his guide, and set out to find the witch. Savage beasts came rushing and roar-

ing at them, but when the palmer waved his staff they slunk away. On they went till they reached a beautiful ivory palace. A young man at the gate offered them wine, but they would not drink it. They went through lovely gardens, gay with flowers, and fountains, and ringing with the song of birds. A beautiful lady wished to persuade them to drink the grape juice which she squeezed into a cup for them, but Guyon dashed the cup to the ground, and pressed on till he found the witch lying on a bed of red roses. Creeping softly up, he flung a net over her, and made her a captive. Then he destroyed her palace that it might entice no one else, and led her away a prisoner to the boat. As they went the savage beasts came rushing at them again, but the palmer touched them with his staff, and lo! they were changed into men. They had all been men once, but had been turned into beasts by the power of the wicked witch. For the wicked witch is just Sin, who makes men like beasts, when they listen to her tempting songs and taste the wine she offers them. Some of the men looked angry when they saw the witch a prisoner, and some were full of shame for their past conduct, but all were glad for being delivered. All, indeed, except one. His name was Grille, and he had been changed into a pig. He had been a pig so long that he had grown used to it, and could not think of anything better. So he only grunted in a discontented way, and said, 'Why did you not leave me alone? I *wish* to be a pig. It is far better to be a pig than a man. There are plenty of roots and acorns here, and nice mud to roll in. What more do I want?' Sir Guyon was very much surprised at his ingratitude and said,

> 'See the mind of beastly man,
> That hath so soone forgot the excellence
> Of his creation, when he life began,
> That now he chooseth with vile difference
> To be a beast, and lacke intelligence.'

Then the palmer said,

> 'Let Grille be Grille, and have his hoggish mind:
> But let us hence depart, whilst weather serves and wind.'

So the good old man touched him again, and changed him back. Then the boat sailed away and carried Guyon and the palmer back to the palace of the Faerie Queen, the men who had been restored went back to their own homes, and Grille was left to root and grub to his heart's content.

Now that was a choice to make! He liked being a pig! You may have heard of some one who was as greedy as a pig, or as lazy, or as dirty, or as obstinate as a pig, but nobody likes being compared to a pig, much less being one. There was a time when Grille did not like it either, when he thought his heart was broken because he knew he had become a pig; but that was so long ago that he had quite forgotten it, and now he would not be anything else though he had the chance.

Of course you don't mean to grow up lazy and greedy and obstinate. Then take care. Now, while you are young, is the time to form your habits. You are shaping your character now, and it will not be easy to change it afterwards. You are growing like your companions, whether you choose good or bad ones. You are filling your minds with pure thoughts from good books, or with bad things from trashy papers. Perhaps you are giving in to what you know is wrong, instead of fighting against it. If it is pleasant you have not courage to refuse it, as Sir Guyon dashed down the enchanted wine that was offered him. All these things are making your future character. You are *changing yourself* into something, and time will show what it will be. So when people point out faults to you, and advise you not to get into bad habits, you should be grateful, and try to put them right. How sad it would be if you made yourself into a growling bear, or a sneaking fox, or a coarse grovelling pig. It would take more than the touch of a magician's wand to undo it. Worst of all, there will come a time when you do not wish to change. It is too much trouble. You had rather be a pig!

Missionaries in the poor parts of our cities say that the most hopeful part of their work is among the children, because their character is not yet formed, and they may, when they see what is good, follow it, and grow up good men and women. When people have become accustomed to sinful habits, it is very very difficult to help them. They cannot change themselves, and they have lost the wish to be changed.

There is only One who can change people back from the sad shapes they have made for themselves —the Saviour of the world. Even He cannot do it against their will. He grieved over the city of Jerusalem, and said, 'O Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth

gather her brood under her wings, and ye *would not*!' And again He said to the people of Jerusalem, 'Ye *will not come* unto me, that ye may have life.' He offered them salvation from their sins, and life with Him in heaven for ever. He begged them to take it but they would not have it, and He could not give it to them against their will.

You are made in the image of God, will you not give Him your hearts to keep now, before sin has laid its spell upon them, lest it should change you into its own ugliness, and you should be content, and forget what God meant you to be—His dear children?

IV.

Look Straight Ahead.

The Rev. E. W. Shepheard-Walwyn has published a volume of Talks with Boys and Boy Scouts, under the title of *Look Straight Ahead* (Allenson; 1s. 6d. net). We shall quote the talk that gives the book its title:—

A boy went to learn farming. The first morning he was taken out to see how ploughing was done. He said:

'Any silly can do that. All you've got to do is to hold the handles, and the horse does the work.'

So the farmer let him try. The line went all crooked, and he felt very sheepish.

'What were you looking at when you ploughed?' his master asked him.

'Looking at?—er—I was watching the funny things the plough turned up, beetles and crooked stones,' he said.

'Exactly. Look at something *on ahead*—that tall bit in the hedge, for instance.'

So he tried again.

The second time the line went all over the place.

'There now! I looked at something in front,' said the boy.

'What did you look at?' asked the farmer.

'Well—er—there was a cow fooling about in front of me.'

'And you looked at that? Silly boy. Look at a *stationary object*, something that doesn't move, I told you—that little tree in the hedge.'

So he learnt to plough at last.

You boys have a long line to plough through the world. If you look *near* at hand, I mean, at yourself, you will make a mess of it.

Looking on oneself too highly, *i.e.* being cocksure and conceited; or looking on oneself too lowly, *i.e.* being downhearted—both result in crooked lines.

Looking at the cow is like copying good people. They make mistakes. The cow was first here then there. So 'good' people make mistakes. They do a 'good' thing one day, and something not so good another day.

Some quite kind men and women are making most serious mistakes, for instance, about Sunday, and are letting the boys have their week-day fun on God's day, so that they may not be 'dull.'

So, never say, 'It must be all right to do that, because so-and-so does it, who is *such* a nice person.' Else you will plough your own line all crooked. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews tells about a lot of good men of the Old Testament, Abraham, David, Samuel, etc.

Then chapter 12 begins: '*Seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses* (*i.e.* all these 'good people' watching us from the other world), *let us run with patience the race* (or plough the line) *that is set before us, looking unto* ——.'

Well, you would think that, having filled a whole chapter with talking about these 'good people' of the Old Testament, it is surely going to say, 'Looking unto *them*,' as examples. But it deliberately leaves the whole lot out, and puts another name—'*Jesus*.'

He is the 'stationary object,' the 'same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' If you put Him up in front of you, you will always plough straight.

If you think how He used to speak to His mother, and the kind of books He was likely to have been fond of reading, then all your own words to your mother will be kind and manly, and you will never read anything you will afterwards struggle in vain to forget.

Some, when they are rude, say, 'Oh, it's only in fun.' They have not looked hard enough at Jesus Christ to *see* what a smudgy thing rudeness is.

Others will tell a lie, and say, 'It's only a green one.' They have not looked hard enough at Jesus to see that all lies are black, none are 'white' *or* 'green.'

The Lord Jesus first ploughed the line Himself through life without a mistake, and has been standing at the end of it ever since, and is beckoning

you on with His wounded hand to follow in His steps. If you could catch but a glimpse of the love in His eyes as He watches you, it would then be easy to go on trying, and not to be discouraged in the Christian life. For His eyes have the most amazing power in them. They can draw you through any difficulty, and out of anything bad you ever get into. But you must give proper time, in your prayers, and on Sunday, to get a look right into His eyes. A hurried look is no use, as then your look and His *haven't time to get clinched together.*

The Pioneer of Faith and of Salvation.

A STUDY OF THE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

By the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London.

I.

1. One of the objects of the religious-historical school, which it pursues with great ingenuity and industry, is to *correlate* Christianity with other religions, to minimize its originality and to magnify its borrowings. Much is made of the dependence of the Fourth Gospel on Philo, of Paul on Stoicism or the mystery-cults, of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the Platonic doctrine of ideas, and even of Jesus on Jewish Apocalyptic. It is no interest of Christian theology to deny altogether any of these connexions; but it is its duty to challenge the too exclusive attention given to these relations, and so the disproportionate impression made of their influence. It is in the moral and religious realm that the uniqueness of Christianity lies; and the reality of the personal experiences of believers, dependent on, and reproductive of, the personal experience of Jesus, is the absolutely original contribution of Christianity to the religious and moral life of mankind. This reality transforms, and so invests with fresh meaning and new worth, any elements of religion or morals which, as an organism affected by its environment, the Christian faith may have borrowed; and it is its assimilation of what seem foreign elements that is a proof of its vitality.

2. Applying these general considerations to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may observe (i.) how the Platonic contrast between reality and appearance, the heavenly substance and the earthly shadow, is resolved into unity in the personal experience of Jesus, and (ii.) how the personal experience of Jesus is the source and the pattern of the personal experience of believers, so that they too, even as He, have risen above that contrast. He who is the Pioneer of their salvation (2^{10}) is also the pioneer of their faith (12^{2}); and through faith in Him, who is 'the effulgence of God's glory, and the very impress of his substance' (ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, 1^{3}), they possess the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen (ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων, 11^{1}). The disparagement of the image in comparison with the idea, characteristic of Platonism, the author of Hebrews does pronounce regarding the whole Levitical ritual system; but the salvation and the sacrifice of Christ do not belong to the inferior earthly order, but to the perfect heavenly order; and here man is in contact not with transitory appearance, but with eternal reality. We may apply to his standpoint Rothe's declaration that *the ethical is the ontological.* The author is the master and not the slave of the philosophy he uses for his own purpose.

3. While a false and wrong use was made of the distinction between the religion of Jesus and the Christian religion in order to depreciate the latter in comparison with the former, yet Christian theologians have made a profound mistake who, to assert the claim of the second, have ignored the worth of the first. Christ Jesus is both the object and the subject of faith, and He is the one only because He is the other; in His own sacrifice He realized the salvation which the believer receives from Him. We can escape an intolerable legalism, formalism, and externalism in dealing with this doctrine of the

Atonement only as we cease regarding it as a solitary, mysterious transaction between Christ and God, which has no analogy in the moral and religious experience of man; and we can make the doctrine intelligible and credible only as we interpret it, not only as a personal experience of Jesus, but as an experience of so typical and universal a character that it is to be reproduced in the believer. What Christ has done *for us* on His Cross is to be again done *in us* by the Spirit. Any doctrine of substitution is a legal fiction only, if it is not interpreted as a self-identification of Christ with man in grace, and of man with Christ in faith. Evangelicalism will never bully men, as is the manner of some of its representatives, into the acceptance of a doctrine which does not win them by its convincing, commanding moral and religious reality.

4. Herrmann in his religious classic, *The Communion of the Christian with God*, makes the 'inner life' of Jesus the power of God unto salvation; and the concentration of the interest of the Apostolic Age on the death and the rising again of Jesus does not justify any modern writer in his disparagement of 'the Synoptic Figure.' By the study of the 'inner life' of Jesus as thus disclosed (as also in the Fourth Gospel) we can learn much as to His relation to God and to man which gives an intelligible content to this sacrifice as not only the source but also the type of His salvation for men. And it is this that seems to me the most promising development in modern theology. In what has been called Paul's *faith mysticism* there is presented a close analogy between the experience of the Saviour and the Saved; our salvation consists in our having been crucified and having been raised to newness of life in Him (Ro 6^{1-11}). It is a curious theological ineptitude which, instead of re-interpreting the previous chapters from this fresh standpoint, would resolve this vital into that legal conception. But Paul does not deal closely enough with the 'inner life' of Jesus to give full content to his own analogy. This the author of *Hebrews* has done; and it is in his interpretation of the Atonement from the standpoint of Jesus' personal experience that he has made his most valuable contribution to our understanding of the truth and grace of Christ.

II.

1. In attempting a study of the several passages in which the personal experience of Jesus is dealt with, we may first of all discuss the proofs he offers of the reality of the humanity of Jesus in 2^{12-13}. At first sight the quotations from the Old Testament may seem arbitrary illustrations of the artificial exegetical methods then current; but if we study more closely the passages in their original context, and in the context given to them, that impression will be removed. It is not the word *brethren* in the first quotation, nor the word *children* in the third that asserts the link of a common humanity between Jesus and men: but each of these quotations relates to a personal experience, and it is such a personal experience that is quite unequivocally asserted in the second quotation. The first quotation, 'I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation will I sing thy praise,' is taken from Ps 22^{22}, the same psalm as gave Jesus the words in which He uttered His desolation of soul (v.[1]). What the psalmist expresses his intention of declaring is the deliverance which God will accomplish for him; and the word *brethren* surely points, not to a common physical nature only, but to a common personal experience. While the former is the necessary condition of the latter; and the author of Hebrews, as the phrase 'blood and flesh' in v.[14] shows, has the one in view, he does not, owing to the close connexion, exclude the other. The next quotation, 'I will put my trust in him,' is probably derived from Is 8^{17} (LXX); and it asserts the prophet's continued dependence on and confidence in God, even although He is hiding 'His face from the house of Jacob.' If we complete the next quotation, 'Behold, I and the children which God hath given me,' by the words following, 'are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth in mount Zion' (v.[18]), and recall that the prophet's own name and the names he gave his children were significant of God's dealings with His people, we find ourselves in the same atmosphere of moral and religious and not merely physical reality. It is a common personal experience in relation to God, and not only a common physical nature from God, that is the bond of union between Christ and mankind. The unity is that of *the sanctifier* and *the sanctified* (v.[11]), and this implies more than, although it must include, common *blood and flesh*. Again, the declaration in the v.[16], 'For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham,' even if

ἐπιλαν βάνεται has not the fuller meaning of 'layeth hold *to help*,' need not refer exclusively to physical descent from Abraham, but may and probably does, include likeness in faith, as in Gal 3^7, 'They which be of faith, the same are sons of Abraham.'

2. This line of interpretation is confirmed by the part assigned both to God and to Christ in this process of sanctification. (i.) There seems to be little doubt that the reference in the phrase ἐξ ἑνός is to God, and neither to Adam nor to Abraham, as the common ancestor either of mankind or of the chosen people. God has one purpose, and accordingly also one method in *Him that sanctifieth* and in *them that are sanctified. The many sons in being brought to glory are perfected through suffering*: and so it is in accord with the divine method of dealing that the pioneer of salvation should pass through the same experience (v.[10]). This interpretation gives a much fuller content to the phrase than if it meant only that God assigned to *sanctifier* and *sanctified* the same physical nature. (ii.) The clause 'he is not ashamed' as applied to Christ has also fuller value, if it means not merely the assumption in the Incarnation of a human nature, but the voluntary participation in all human experience. It is said of the *Pioneer of faith* that in enduring the cross, He despised shame (12^2); and probably in the present passage there is a similar reference, as the entire context is concerned, not merely with the human nature, but particularly with the human experience of Christ. Father and Son alike willed the Incarnation as a complete self-identification with distinctive human experience.

3. In insisting on this view we are simply affirming the standpoint from which all the references in this Epistle to the life and work of Christ are to be understood. Because this is its standpoint the Epistle is of so great value as a challenge of the sacerdotal and sacramentarian position. The Epistle does speak of priesthood and sacrifice, but only to assert the valuelessness of any official priesthood and any material sacrifice, and to substitute for them the priesthood of character perfected by experience, and the sacrifice of sympathy with man, and obedience to God. No objection could be taken to the tendency to emphasize the fact of Incarnation as central to Christianity, if incarnation were not represented as a physical process in itself through sacramental channels valuable and efficacious for man's salvation, but always as a moral and religious experience, even as it is represented in this Epistle. The atonement of God and man is not in the union in one person of human and divine natures, but in the genuinely and intensely human experience of the Son of God, His liability to temptation, His subjection to suffering, His exercise of obedience and sympathy, His endurance of all that may be involved in death. If this is what is significant and valuable in the Incarnation, its benefits will be conveyed to man, not by the material channels of sacraments, but by the spiritual channels of His grace and man's faith.

Literature.

HENRY FAWCETT.

Put the right biography into the hands of one whose face is turned to life and there is nothing better that you can do. Put the biography of Henry Fawcett into his hands. If Sir Leslie Stephen's is too large, take Winifred Holt's. Its title is *A Beacon for the Blind* (Constable; 7s. 6d. net). We are all blind, though not in the sense in which Henry Fawcett was blind. We are blind to truth and sympathy and sacrifice. And the value of the biography of Henry Fawcett lies in this, that where we are blind, he was clear-sighted.

The story of his life is told simply and yet enthusiastically. A noble life it was, and the very reading of it, even the re-reading of it in this pleasant way, is uplifting. There is humour too. For Fawcett was an all-round man, with a weakness for political economy. The following anecdote refers to the time when he was a Fellow of Trinity College, before he was made a Professor and long before he became Postmaster-General.

'Such was the reputation for extreme opinions Fawcett and Stephen had given by their connection with Trinity Hall, that a certain country squire of ancient lineage and Conservative principles hesitated whether he dared send his son to the college where his ancestors had gained their learn-

ing. He decided to visit Cambridge, and there interviewed Stephen and Fawcett. He told them with unfeigned horror of the serious charges of Radicalism against the college that made him afraid to entrust his son to its keeping. The grave Fellows compared notes solemnly before answering the father, then Fawcett reassured him, saying that the rumours which he had heard had been much exaggerated, and though at one time "some of us had been rather infected with extreme opinions, now we have greatly moderated our views, and shall be content simply with the Disestablishment of the Church and the abolition of the Throne."'

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

St. Matthew's Gospel, till lately much neglected by the commentator, is now well furnished with scholarly commentaries. First came Archdeacon Allen's in the 'International Critical' Series. Dr. Plummer's rather more popular and expository work followed. And now we have *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, by Alan Hugh M'Neile, D.D. (Macmillan; 15s.).

Dr. M'Neile offers a short introduction—for the shortness of which he hopes to receive the gratitude of his readers. The space thus saved he uses for Additional Notes. This is the chief feature of the book. It contains thirty-two Additional Notes, in which special difficulties of text, or interpretation, or criticism, or theology are separately discussed. And it may be said confidently that no part of the book is better done or more acceptable. We shall look at two of these Additional Notes.

But before doing so, we may say that the ordinary notes have all the qualities of the best Cambridge work. It is probable that Messrs. Macmillan have still before them the idea of offering commentaries on all the books of the New Testament, in order to complete the scheme started by Lightfoot and Westcott and Hort. If so, this may be reckoned a step towards its fulfilment. The very binding corresponds with Lightfoot's *Colossians* and Westcott's *Hebrews*. And the notes have the same accuracy and independence that marked the work of the three famous Cambridge scholars.

It may be useful to name the commentaries now published in this form. They are M'Neile's *St. Matthew*; Swetes' *St. Mark*; Lightfoot's *Galatians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon*; Robinson's *Ephesians*; Milligan's *Thessalonians*; Westcott's *Hebrews*, and the *Epistles of St. John*; Mayor's *St. James*, and *Jude and II. Peter*; Swete's *Apocalypse*.

The subjects separately discussed by Dr. M'Neile which we wish to look at are the Virgin Birth and the Transfiguration.

The Virgin Birth.—Dr. M'Neile accepts the Virgin Birth of our Lord as a historical fact. He does so on two grounds—first, because no credible explanation of it, if fictitious, has been suggested; and next, because it is in agreement with the whole body of Christian belief.

If it is a fiction, the origin of the fiction is either Jewish or pagan, or it is a mixture of both. Those who say it is Jewish refer to the Immanuel prophecy of Isaiah as having suggested it. But if this prophecy had such an influence, how is it that, except in Mt 1^{23}, it is nowhere in the New Testament even remotely alluded to? Against the suggestion that the idea is of pagan origin are the facts that the narratives of the Virgin Birth are intensely Jewish, and that it would then be the work of Gentile Christians and of too late a date. The intermediate theory, that it is part Jewish and part pagan—that pagan mythology had moulded the ideas of certain Jewish circles—is Cheyne's suggestion. It has all the disadvantages of the other proposals and no advantages of its own.

Dr. M'Neile concludes: 'The belief, if not necessary to, is entirely congruous with, the apostle's attitude towards Christ as the "new Man," the "second Adam," *i.e.* the Founder and Source of a new and spiritual race. It is this congruity with the whole body of Christian belief, with the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Sacraments, which turns the scale for those who will not assert that miracles do not happen, much less that a miracle, avowedly unique, did not happen, but whom the literary evidence leaves in suspense.'

The Transfiguration.—It is still true that the Transfiguration is waiting its expositor. What was it meant to accomplish? And for whom? Dr. M'Neile sees one purpose in it. It was given to show that in Christ the Jewish religion had its fulfilment and was now to pass away.

It contains, he says, three main points. These are (1) the metamorphosis; (2) the converse with Moses and Elijah; and (3) the divine endorsement.

The metamorphosis or transfiguration recalls the shining of the face of Moses described in Exodus. This was a borrowed glory, and passed away. It signified the divine origin of the Law, which was now 'being done away.' But the Law and the Prophets, while passing away, are not lost; they find themselves realized in the new law of the Spirit of Christ. This is symbolized by the conversation which Moses and Elijah had with Christ—a conversation to be set beside that which each of them had already had with God (Ex 31^{18}, 1 K 19^{9}). Finally, the cloud descends; the Sonship of Christ is divinely attested; to hear Him is to hear the eternal truth of which the Law and the Prophets were but partial expressions. 'To attempt, therefore, to provide for the continuous presence of Moses and Elijah was a grave mistake; all that Christians need is to have that of "Jesus Himself."'

AFFIRMATIONS.

Dr. Havelock Ellis has issued a new edition of *Affirmations* (Constable; 6s. net). He has issued it without alteration of text, but he has written a new Preface. The book contains what some would call 'appreciations' of Nietzsche, Casanova, Zola, Huysmans, and 'St. Francis and others.' And these 'affirmations,' as Dr. Ellis calls them, stand after seventeen years. With the rest Nietzsche stands, even gaining something by the events of these late months.

Is not this shot through with new significance?

'Between 1873 and 1876 Nietzsche wrote four essays—on "David Strauss," "The Use and Abuse of History in relation to Life," "Schopenhauer as an Educator," and "Richard Wagner"—which were published as a series of *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen*. The essay on Strauss was written soon after the great war, amid the resulting outburst of flamboyant patriotism and the widely-expressed conviction that the war was a victory of "German culture." Fresh from the world of Greece, Nietzsche pours contempt on that assumption. Culture, he says, is, above all, unity of artistic style in every expression of a people's life. The exuberance of knowledge in which a German glories is neither a necessary means of culture nor a sign of it, being, indeed, more allied to the opposite of culture—to barbarism. It is in this barbarism that the modern German lives, that is to say, in a chaotic mixture of old styles. Look at his clothing, Nietzsche continues, his houses, his streets, all his manners and customs. They are a turmoil of all styles in which he peacefully lives and moves. Such culture is really a phlegmatic absence of all sense of culture. Largely, also, it is merely a bad imitation of the real and productive culture of France, which it is supposed to have conquered in 1870. Let there be no chatter, he concludes, about the triumph of German culture, for at present no real German culture exists. The heroic figures of the German past were not "classics," as some imagine; they were seekers after a genuine German culture, and so regarded themselves. The would-be children of culture in Germany to-day are Philistines without knowing it, and the only unity they have achieved is a methodical barbarism.'

THE RELIGIOUS QUEST OF INDIA.

The Rev. J. N. Farquhar, M.A., and the Rev. H. D. Griswold, M.A., Ph.D., are the editors of a new series of volumes on the religion of India, to be published by Mr. Humphrey Milford at the Oxford University Press. Two volumes of the series have come out—*Indian Theism from the Vedic to the Muhammadan Period*, by Nicol Macnicol, M.A., D.Litt. (6s. net), and *The Heart of Jainism*, by Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson, M.A., Sc.D. (7s. 6d. net).

The series is to go by the general title of 'The Religious Quest of India.' What is the motive of it? There are two motives. We must give them in the editors' own words.

1. The editors endeavour to work in the sincere and sympathetic spirit of science. 'They desire to understand the perplexingly involved developments of thought and life in India and dispassionately to estimate their value. They recognize the futility of any such attempt to understand and evaluate, unless it is grounded in a thorough historical study of the phenomena investigated. In recognizing this fact they do no more than share what is common ground among all modern students of religion of any repute. But they also believe that it is necessary to set the practical side of each system in living relation to the beliefs and the literature, and that, in this regard, the close and direct contact which they have each had with Indian religious life ought to prove a source of valuable light. For, until a clear understanding has been gained of the practical influence exerted

by the habits of worship, by the practice of the ascetic, devotional or occult discipline, by the social organization and by the family system, the real impact of the faith upon the life of the individual and the community cannot be estimated; and, without the advantage of extended personal intercourse, a trustworthy account of the religious experience of a community can scarcely be achieved by even the most careful student.

2. 'They seek to set each form of Indian religion by the side of Christianity in such a way that the relationship may stand out clear. Jesus Christ has become to them the light of all their seeing, and they believe Him destined to be the light of the world. They are persuaded that sooner or later the age-long quest of the Indian spirit for religious truth and power will find in Him at once its goal and a new starting-point, and they will be content if the preparation of this series contributes in the smallest degree to hasten this consummation. If there be readers to whom this motive is unwelcome, they may be reminded that no man approaches the study of a religion without religious convictions, either positive or negative: for both reader and writer, therefore, it is better that these should be explicitly stated at the outset. Moreover, even a complete lack of sympathy with the motive here acknowledged need not diminish a reader's interest in following an honest and careful attempt to bring the religions of India into comparison with the religion which to-day is their only possible rival, and to which they largely owe their present noticeable and significant revival.'

Well, we have read these two volumes with some care—not out of mere good pleasure, nor because they are before us for review, but because we have been working on the religion of India for some time and wished to know what light these two authors, whom we already knew to be competent, could throw on the many perplexing problems which that study scatters on every learner's path. And we are prepared to say that they are written up to the editors' ideas with astonishing success, yet never fail to charm and enlighten the man who merely wants to know. Dr. Macnicol has had the easier task, or at least he has made it seem to be the easier. Mrs. Stevenson has pushed her way through much unfamiliar jungle and come out again into the light of day. Not every reader of books will struggle through with her; or think it worth while. And yet how truly Indian the book is; how marvellous the revelation it gives us of the overcoming there must be before the philosophical mind of India can be won for Christ.

Dr. Macnicol is very agreeable reading. What it has cost him to be so easy we shall never know. We should know only if we tried to write a book like this ourselves.

One of the best short commentaries ever issued was that of Dr. Sutherland Black on Judges in the 'Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools.' Only a little larger is *The Book of Judges*, according to the Revised Version, by H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A., also issued by the Cambridge Press (1s. 6d. net). But Mr. Lanchester suffers nothing by the comparison. He has twenty-three years' research to build with. And he has his own most accurate and disciplined scholarship.

Mr. E. W. Lummis, M.A., of King's College, Cambridge, has made a contribution to the Synoptic Problem which is just as startling as the latest German pamphlet used to be, and much more stable. He believes, as almost everybody now believes, that, for the matter which they have in common with Mark, Matthew and Luke were dependent on that Gospel. But the matter which they have in common with one another and which is not taken from Mark he does not believe that they both took from some third source; he believes that Luke took it from Matthew. And to prove it he has published his book *How Luke was Written* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 4s. 6d. net).

Dr. Rendel Harris has written a recommendation of *Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 5s. net), and after his words no one will hesitate to buy the book. The author is Theodore H. Robinson, M.A., B.D., Professor of Hebrew and Syriac in Serampore College.

Two books have been added to Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'Primers for Teachers and Senior Bible Class Students.' One is an introduction to the understanding of *The First Three Gospels*, by the Rev. W. Manson, B.A.; the other is an introduction to the practice of *The Christian Life*, by the Rev. R. H. Coats, M.A., B.D. (6d. net each). They agree together. First from Mr. Manson's

wonder of compression, clear and attractive, we learn what the Gospels tell us about themselves as the source of our knowledge of Christ and about Christ as the source of our life. Then by Mr. Coats we are taught what our life as the followers of Christ is and how we may live it. The books seem to us as well fitted for the uneducated as for the educated, for manhood as for youth.

There is a long lucid chapter on Mysticism in *The Magic of Experience*, by H. Stanley Redgrove (Dent; 2s. 6d. net), which is as likely to carry a mere beginner into that elusive subject as any chapter or book that has been written. For it is written with sufficient knowledge and with the most complete command of language. But that is not all the volume. The volume is an exposition of a system of philosophy which the author calls 'Idealistic or Rational Empiricism.' He thus explains: 'I use the term "empiricism," because I believe that no true knowledge is attainable apart from experience. I use the term "rational," because I believe that bare experience it not sufficient for this end: experience must be interpreted by reason. Experience, I believe, is the obverse of a coin of which the reverse is revelation: inductive reasoning is, in a sense, a magic ritual whereby fuller or higher revelation becomes possible: but the data of experience are the symbolic elements of this ritual, without which it cannot be performed or its products obtained. Finally, I use the term "idealistic," because I believe that all knowledge is knowledge of ideas, of the relations between ideas, and of minds wherein ideas exist.'

The early Quaker men must have been very good if they were better than the early Quaker women. Mabel Richmond Brailsford gives an account of the character and sufferings and work of *Quaker Women* from 1650 to 1690 (Duckworth; 7s. 6d. net). The greatest of them all was Margaret Fell, who became the wife of George Fox. Her story is well told, and it was surely well worth telling again. But the least of them all is great, persecution having given them the opportunity which they promptly seized. We do not fear in any single instance to anticipate the judgment of the future: 'These are they who have come out of the great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'

The Rev. Thomas Kirk, Senior Minister of Haymarket United Free Church, Edinburgh, has already written monographs on Samson, Saul, Joseph, Jonah, and Daniel; and now he has written a monograph on Solomon. The title is *Solomon: His Life and Works* (Andrew Elliot; 3s. net). To profit by Mr. Kirk one must forget all that has been done on the criticism of the Bible and take it traditionally. Then the story that is told will be read with enjoyment, for the author has an attractive style of writing.

Not only the members of the Society of Friends, but also all those whose minds turn hopefully towards the ideal of Christian life for which the Friends stand, are well acquainted with the Swarthmore Lectures. Since 1907, they have been delivered and published every year, and by their breadth of sympathy, together with their spirituality, they have attracted many to admiration and imitation who will never be called Quakers. The Swarthmore Lecture for 1915 is in keeping. Its author is Silvanus P. Thompson, F.R.S.; its subject *The Quest for Truth* (Headley Brothers; 1s. net).

A series of volumes, entitled 'Modern Handbooks of Religion,' are under issue from the Lindsey Press (2s. net each). They are described as 'Books illustrative of the Principles and Faith of those who find the seat of Authority in Religion not in Church or Creed, but in the Mind and Conscience and Experience of Mankind.'

That description suggests the probability that the enemy is Trinitarianism. But it is not so. The four volumes of the series already issued all look the other way. The enemy is Rationalism. It follows that in the struggle with Rationalism these books are to be welcomed. It is true that Rationalism is not now the force that even a few years ago it threatened to be. It has become practically identified with materialism, and as an explanation of the universe, materialism has been steadily losing ground. But if they are fighting a losing battle, the rationalists are still fighting. And some of them in this country have a gift of plausible speaking which must be watched with vigilance. Their scholarship is not formidable, but they are not easily beaten in public persuasiveness. These books, therefore, written by Unitarians who are really scholars, are to be heartily welcomed.

For they are addressed to the very multitude with whom the rationalist finds acceptance. And they are written, every one of them, with an excellent understanding of the popular mind. More than that, they anticipate, they do not wait for the approach of the materialist. They seek to furnish men's minds with a right conception of Religion, that they may be fortified against the attack of Rationalism, however well armed with clever arguments and other weapons of moral frightfulness.

The volumes published are: (1) *Religion as affected by Modern Science and Philosophy*, by Stanley A. Mellor, B.A., Ph.D.; (2) *Religion in Social and National Life*, by H. D. Roberts; (3) *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, by Herbert McLachlan, M.A., B.D.; and (4) *Communion of Man with God*, by R. Nicol Cross, M.A.

Each volume contains a bibliography of its subject. But the worth of the books must not be estimated by the bibliographies. For in no case is the list of literature so good as it might have been.

The publishers have done their part well. The books are very cheap and very attractive.

The Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, has published three sermons. The first sermon is on Faith, the second on Hope, the third on Love. Yet Dr. Murray calls the volume containing them *The Courage of Hope* (Lay Reader Headquarters; 1s. net). Has he decided to challenge the apostle's judgment that the greatest of these is Love? Perhaps not. But he has decided to challenge the judgment of the ordinary Christian in our own day that Hope is a feeble third to Faith and Love.

In writing the book entitled *My Priesthood* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. Walter J. Carey, M.A., sets out deliberately to prove that the priest is a person apart from the people. But he does this, not to conclude that therefore the priest is to be courted and considered and think himself a superior person, but to insist upon his regarding himself as called to be humble and self-sacrificing and the servant of all. We think the separation which Mr. Carey seeks is excessive and unscriptural, but we approve of the devotion which he demands. There is one chapter in the book which every minister of Christ might read with profit. It is the chapter entitled 'The Priest as Missioner.' On the matter of 'missions' Mr. Carey is a generation in front.

The Right Rev. Charles H. Brent, Bishop of the Philippine Islands, is a preacher. Every sermon in the volume *Prisoners of Hope* (Longmans; 5s. net) has cost him time and toil and trouble. And trouble, we say; for there is in every sermon a thought that has come out of the great tribulation. Take the sermon on Fairness. It demands a man who has won to preach an acceptable sermon on that. How dare he, unless he has risen out of the bigotry and bias so overwhelmingly associated with religion? And how could he speak of the Incarnation as due in fairness from God, unless he has shared the fellowship of the sufferings of the Incarnated? What an optimist he is—as all are who have come through. They know whom they have believed and are persuaded.

The last sermon in the book is on Flag Day. It ends with this:

'Nobly, nobly Cape S. Vincent to the northwest died away;
Sunset ran, one glorious blood-red, reeking into Cadiz Bay;
Bluish 'mid the burning water, full in face Trafalgar lay;
In the dimmest northeast distance dawned Gibraltar grand and gray;
Here and here did England help me; how can I help England, say!
Whoso turns as I this evening, turns to God to praise and pray,
While Jove's planet rises yonder silent over Africa.'

Messrs. Macmillan are the publishers of a new series of books which we wish we could place in every school and home library. It is true they are wholly devoted to the body, and on every page touch matters material rather than spiritual. But we have come at last to understand that the body also is a constant thought to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The series goes by the general title of 'The Health Series of Physiology and Hygiene.' The volume which has been sent us has the title of *Making the Most of Life* (3s. 6d.). It is the work of two authors, M. V. O'Shea, Professor of Education, in the

University of Wisconsin, and J. H. Kellogg, Superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. Every paragraph seems to have been well weighed, is clear to the understanding of the youngest, and touches the stern facts of daily living.

To 'Every Christian's Library' of very evangelical volumes Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have added *The Life that Pleases God*, a practical treatise on the preservation of the Spirit and Soul and Body, by A. T. Schofield, M.D., M.R.C.S. (1s. net).

Every sermon in the Rev. A. W. Gough's *God's Strong People* (Scott; 2s. 6d. net) is swept into the swirl of the war. Nevertheless they are not war sermons. They speak about the war; they are thrilled by the war; yet they are sermons on their texts, and out of their texts bring moral and religious truths, good for all times and peoples. Clearly Mr. Gough is a wise steward.

A small volume of simple evangelical sermons has been published by the Rev. J. Lionel Homer, Incumbent of Cargill, Canada, under the title of *Spiritual Fundamentals* (Stock; 3s. net).

Through the same publishers, but from the other end of the earth, there comes a volume of sermons, dealing also with fundamental and spiritual things, and with similar evangelical simplicity. The title is *Seeing the Invisible*, and the author is the late Rev. N. A. Ross, M.A., LL.D., of Johannesburg (2s. 6d. net).

Professor H. A. Giles, LL.D., the author of the Hibbert Lectures for 1914 on *Confucianism and its Rivals* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), is a specialist. The moment he oversteps his boundaries he flounders hopelessly. His remarks about the Bible are full of humour, which is as harmless as it is unconscious. The lectures are popular, and for that reason they are not likely to obtain a large circulation, for the study of the religions of the world is not a popular study yet, though it is moving in that direction. First the scholars, and then the people.

In discussing the difficulties which Christianity has to meet in China, Dr. Giles lays stress on these three: 'First of all, the Confucian dogma that man is born good; secondly, the practice of ancestral worship, which, as has already been shown, is incompatible with Christian doctrine; and thirdly, the rules and practice of filial piety, due directly to the patriarchal system which still obtains in China. It has indeed been seriously urged that the unparalleled continuity of the Chinese nation is a reward for their faithful observance of the fifth commandment. In the face of this deeply implanted sentiment of reverence for parents, it is easy to see what a shock it must give to be told, as in Mk $10^{7.\ 29.\ 30}$, that a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife; also, that if a man leaves his father and mother for Christ's sake and the gospel's, he will receive an hundredfold now in this time, and in the world to come eternal life.'

The Study of Theology.

By the Rev. J. Agar Beet, D.D., Richmond.

In the June number of this magazine, Mr. Alban G. Widgery brings a serious indictment against theology, or at least against theologians, and contrasts theology unfavourably with other branches of knowledge. That this indictment contains much truth, I do not deny: but it is not a fair statement of the whole case; and the writer does not suggest a practical remedy. The seriousness of the matter prompts me to discuss it in this paper, and to propose a remedy.

The indictment is as follows: 'Theology alone still suffers from absolute uncertainty and poverty of method. For in the Christian world Theology has been and is almost entirely dogmatic, starting with certain quite arbitrary assumptions and arguing to certain foregone conclusions. The chief assumptions are the truth of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and, among Catholics, the validity of the claim of the Church to interpret them. The foregone conclusions may be summarized as the traditional creeds. At times philosophers have independently discussed theological problems, but no free scientific Theology has yet been established. In this region of research, the

greatest need of to-day is perfect liberty to seek and proclaim the truth, unconcerned by the acquiescence or denial of the dignitaries of any ecclesiastical organization whatever.'

Touching the manuals put into the hands of students in some minor schools of theology, the above charge is true. But it is utterly untrue of the works of the best modern theologians. Of these, I may mention, as the ablest book of the kind which I have ever seen, Neander's *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, published at Berlin in 1832 and frequently republished and translated. Throughout this great work, all conclusions rest on decisive evidence adduced, and are deduced from it by rational inference which compels conviction. The chief evidence is found in the sacred records preserved in the New Testament; these being tested, touching their genuineness, correctness of text, truth, and worth, in the full light of the scholarship of the day in which the book was written. Moreover, the modern scholarship which, since that day, has given us a purer text of the New Testament has done little or nothing to modify or add to the theological results recorded in the work mentioned above.

The evils referred to by Mr. Widgery flow from the complicated relation between the results of modern research and the traditional teaching of the Churches. In all ages, the disciples of Christ have been grouped in communities smaller or larger, bound together by mutual help and a common faith, propagated by oral teaching, public and private reading of the Bible and other books, and various forms of worship. This traditional belief reproduces for the more part the actual teaching of Christ, and has commended itself as substantially true by its influence on the mind, heart, and life of multitudes of men and women in all ages and in all positions in life.

In different communities theological tradition took different, and sometimes contradictory, forms; and these differences gave rise to theological controversy. This contradiction reveals error on one or both sides. And, in many cases, the error escaped detection because of the helpful truth with which it was associated.

These varieties of belief took permanent form in carefully worded creeds, convenient records of the belief of those who made them. Of these I may mention, as the most valuable of them all, what is now commonly called the Nicene Creed, a wonderful link binding together all the older and many modern Churches. Of modern creeds, I may add the Augsburg Confession, the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Anglican Articles, and the Westminster Confession. These various formularies reveal, amid minor differences, a wonderful agreement, each with the others, and all with the teaching of the New Testament. Some other forms, *e.g.* the Articles of the Synod of Dort and those of the Dutch Remonstrants, reveal more acute differences.

Each denomination must have, in order to secure continuance, schools of theology; and in these schools the teaching must be in harmony with the general belief of those who support them. Now in all schools of learning, theological, literary, and scientific, the beliefs of the teachers and the evidence they adduce mould more or less the beliefs of their pupils. For it is much easier and more convenient for these last to accept the conclusions thus set before them ready-made than to sift for themselves the evidence on which they rest. All this, and the material interests involved, tend to warp the judgment, and limit the freedom of thought, of students of theology; and prompts some men, especially in official positions, to conceal secret aberrations from the traditional beliefs. Such concealment is unworthy and degrading.

What, then, is to be done? An adequate remedy, the only remedy, is in the hands of every theological professor, pastor, and church member. Let each one sift carefully for himself the grounds on which rest the beliefs which are living factors in his own religious life as carefully as every man of business sifts the trustworthiness of those to whom he entrusts his goods. This is easier and much less dangerous than at first sight appears. For the points of agreement in all churches are much greater and more important than are the differences. But, whether easy or difficult, safe or dangerous, such sifting of the grounds of our faith is absolutely needful. For with truth error is apt to mingle: and all error obscures and weakens the truth.

What is needed is a profound sense of the importance and sacredness of The Truth. Christ said, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life.' The Truth is the Way of Life. All error leads away from Christ, and towards death. Consequently, our loyalty to Him binds us both to seek

the Truth, and to make known to others whatever truth we believe that we have found, seeking their judgment about it. In other words, we are bound to place, before all sincere inquirers, without reserve, the results of our own search for the Truth. In this search and announcement, many have laid down their lives. But the Truth still lives and reigns in Christ; and is able to repay, and will repay, every sacrifice made on its behalf.

This full and frank statement is specially needful in our day. For every one knows that we do not hold now all that our fathers held and asserted sixty years ago. And intelligent and devout men and women ask what these changes are, on what grounds they rest, and what our teachers are still prepared to assert and maintain. This last is of utmost importance. When the whole case is fully stated, it will appear that all we value most in the Christian tradition is confirmed by modern scholarship, and that the changes which this last has forced upon us strengthen immensely the foundation of the historical faith of the Church.

The chief changes are as follows:

1. Our fathers taught confidently that every statement in the Bible, especially touching morality and religion, is true in the sense intended by the writers. This theory of Inerrancy has been disproved by more careful search of the sacred documents. There are, especially in the Old Testament, moral sentiments expressed and approved which the cultivated moral sense of the disciples of Christ forbids them to accept; and some apparently contradictory statements of fact. Even touching the day on which Christ was put to death, the plain statements in Mt 26^{17}, Mk 14^{12}, Lk 22^{7} are inconsistent with what nearly all scholars accept as more accurate indications of time in Jn 18^{28} 19^{31}.

These inaccuracies, here and there, in small details do not lessen the supreme and infinite value of the sacred records of the life and teaching of Christ. For, in the marvellous general agreement or harmony of the Four Gospels, the Book of Acts, a remarkable Apocalyptic work, and various letters, some of which are traced by decisive evidence, such as can be brought for no other ancient documents, to the founder of the Churches of Europe,—in these various witnesses compared we find abundant evidence, sufficient to banish all doubt, touching the historical reality and the teaching of Christ. In the Old Testament, testing the authorship and date of its various books, and the correctness of our copies, as we should any other similar ancient works, we have evidence abundantly sufficient to prove that God revealed Himself to Israel with a clearness and fulness not given to any other ancient nation.

Thus, in the New and Old Testaments we have all the documentary evidence needful for intelligent and assured faith in Christ and in God. The now absolute theory of Inerrancy, for which no adequate evidence has ever been brought, somewhat obscured this abundant internal evidence of their substantial historical truth. In other words, modern scholarship has been a retreat from an untenable to an impregnable position.

2. Another marked difference between the almost unanimous belief of all thoughtful men to-day and the opinions current sixty years ago touches the human life of the Incarnate Son. It was then too hastily assumed that the Sacred Boy in the temple courts was in full exercise of divine omniscience and omnipotence. Vain attempts were made to harmonize these with the growth in knowledge recorded in Lk 2^{52}, with His ignorance (Mt 24^{36}, Mk 13^{32}) of the day of His return, and (Mt 26^{53}) with the 'twelve legions of angels' ready to rescue Him from His enemies. For growth in knowledge is impossible to one who already knows all things, and the help of angels was superfluous to the Almighty. The true reconciliation is plainly stated in Ph 2^{7}, where we read that 'He emptied himself,' and in 2 Co 8^{9}, 'He became poor, though he was rich.' This self-limitation of the Incarnate Son does not lessen His authority as a Teacher sent by God. For the close harmony of various witnesses is complete proof of their historical correctness; and the appeal of this teaching to man's felt need of salvation, and its verification in the experience and life of untold multitudes, leave no room for doubt that this harmonious and life-giving teaching is a correct reproduction of the actual teaching of Christ and a true statement of the merciful purpose of God.

3. A still more conspicuous change is seen in the treatment, in the modern pulpit, of the Doom of the Lost. Our fathers did not hesitate to say that it would be endless suffering as bad as the agony caused by fire to living and conscious bodies. A keener sense of the mercy of God, and of the due proportion of crime and punishment, has long ago made such teaching impossible. But in this

as in the other cases, we must guard against the opposite extreme. This solemn topic, so conspicuous in the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, has almost vanished from the modern pulpit. This ought not so to be. The way of safety is to follow the writers of the New Testament, who describe it, more frequently than all other expressions put together, by the one Greek word rendered sometimes *destroy* and *destruction*, at other times *perish* and *perdition*, and elsewhere *lose* and *lost*. The word thus rendered means, not necessarily either extinction or endless suffering, but always the loss of whatever gives worth to existence. The solemn teaching in Ph 3^{19}, touching 'the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is *destruction*,' demands emphatic assertion to-day.

Some writers make the great mistake of putting more emphasis upon the small errors which modern scholarship has detected in the ancient traditions of the Church rather than on the all-important elements in which the ancient tradition has been confirmed by modern research. To some ears, discord is more conspicuous than harmony. But the trained ear listens for and delights in concord.

The close agreement between the indisputably genuine letters of Paul, the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John, the Synoptic Gospels, and the Book of Revelation, four very different types of teaching, all coming down to us from the first century, without any substantial note of discord, leave no room for doubt that the Founder of Christianity claimed for Himself a unique relation to God, raising Him above men and angels as the only begotten Son of God; and that this supreme claim was accepted by all His disciples whose opinions have come down to us, with complete confidence, because they had proof which convinced them that the body laid dead in the grave had returned to life and was raised to heaven. Similar harmonious agreement proves that, along with moral teaching loftier than even the highest in the Old Testament, He announced pardon of sins and endless life with God in heaven for all who put faith in Him and walk in His steps; and that He promised to them the Holy Spirit of God, to be in them the breath of a new life of devotion to God, and a divinely-given pledge of endless blessedness. All this rests, as I have proved in my *Manual of Theology*, on decisive historical and documentary evidence, confirmed by an experience which has transformed and raised their whole inward and outward life.

Compared with this evidence, the changes noted above are insignificant.

A serious defect in Mr. Widgery's paper is the oversight of the chief evidence on which theology rests, namely, the religious literature of ancient and modern times, in which lie open to our inspection the thoughts, and in some measure the lives of men who, in all ages and in widely different circumstances, have pondered the great unseen realities which underlie human thought and life.

This literature falls into three clearly marked divisions. Every one who reads carefully (1) the New Testament and compares it with the Old, with other ancient literature, and with later Christian literature, finds in the contrasts thus presented decisive proof that Jesus of Nazareth gave to the world a religious impulse which turned back into a new and better channel the whole course of human life and thought. This claims for the New Testament a supreme place as the earliest record of the most wonderful teaching ever given to man. Similarly, comparison of (2) the Old Testament with (3) all contemporary literature proves that Israel anticipated the teaching of Jesus about God in a measure infinitely above that of any Gentile nation. On the other hand, a comparison of the Old and New Testaments reveals the immense addition which Jesus made to our knowledge of God. Our study of theology must include these three great divisions of religious literature.

This literature is embodied in ancient languages known to us only by philological methods. Yet Mr. Widgery says that 'Far too much time is spent in most of our theological colleges and divinity halls in philological studies, which have not even a secondary value for the ministerial office.' But whatever else they are taught, all theological students need, and may easily gain, a good working knowledge of that wonderful language in which the words of Christ, the narratives of the Evangelists, and the teaching of some of the Apostles, have come down to us. And this implies careful philological study of words, inflexions, and phrases.

Oversight of this primary element of theological research makes Mr. Widgery's paper little more than a caricature. Evidently he has seen theological teaching only in its most defective forms.

He says: 'Except among a few scholars attached to free religious bodies, such (absolute) freedom has never existed in the Christian Churches in the past, and it does not exist to-day. Almost all theological students — including most Professors of Divinity—are officially attached to ecclesiastical organizations, to hold any position in which subscription to specific statements of doctrine is demanded.' He adds: 'Faculties of Theology should be quite free, and in the interest of thought and religion itself no one should be allowed to occupy a Chair of Divinity who holds any position which requires definite adherence to prescribed doctrine.' But he has not faced the difficulties in the way of this negative suggestion. At the same time, the matter of subscription deserves consideration.

But, apart from this, a simpler path is open. Let each one claim and take liberty for himself. For this, all that is needed is the courage of our convictions, inspired by a due appreciation of the infinite value and sacredness of the Truth. This will stimulate earnest and patient search for it, and a frank and unreserved statement, to all sincere inquirers, of whatever we have found. We must also admit the limitations of our knowledge. This will evoke our pupils' confidence, and open a way for their intelligent reception of those many matters for which we can bring decisive evidence.

The above criticisms pass in silence over many good things in Mr. Widgery's thoughtful paper. Even caricature is a legitimate form of literature. And it may do good by calling attention to what in the past has been, and to some extent still is, a serious hindrance to progress in theological thought. We have been more anxious to bring our pupils to our own opinions than to evoke in them intelligent convictions of their own. That so intelligent a man as Mr. Widgery has this opinion about theological method, reveals serious fault somewhere.

Another point to be ever kept in mind by teachers, especially by those who teach the future pastors of the flock of Christ, is that knowledge implies responsibility. Whatever we know about the eternal realities has been revealed to us by God in order that we may pass it on to others. That light shines upon us from and through the Cross of Christ. By teaching the Truth, and so far as our teaching corresponds with the Truth, we impart to others the infinite blessings purchased for us and for them by that great Sacrifice. Consequently our loyalty to Christ binds us to loyalty to the Truth, both in our search for it, and in its announcement to others.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Pre-Hellenic Civilization.[1]

The appearance of the new edition of M. Dussaud's big book, and the publication of Mr. Hall's new volume — a companion to Handcock's *Mesopotamian Archæology*—are very appropriate at the present time, when, even apart from the outbreak of war, there is a kind of pause in the onward movement of investigation.

By and by, no doubt, when things have readjusted themselves in the various areas concerned, the movement will be resumed, perhaps with all the greater vigour for the pause, and probably under very different and more favourable conditions, in some lands at least, than have hitherto characterized the progress of exploration. Meanwhile the pause is a very fitting opportunity for archæological stock-taking, and that is what the volumes of M. Dussaud and Mr. Hall really amount to.

Of the two books, that of M. Dussaud is, of course, incomparably the more exhaustive. It not only covers a good deal more ground than Mr. Hall's, taking in the Troad, which Mr. Hall expressly rules out, and devoting a long chapter (rather too long) to the civilization of Cyprus, which Mr. Hall only handles incidentally; but it also deals at considerable length with matters which the scheme of the English writer's book only permits him to glance at in passing. Thus the chapters on Ægean influence in Palestine and

[1] *Les Civilisations Préhelléniques dans le Bassin de la Mer Égée*. Par René Dussaud. Second edition, 1914. *Ægean Archæology*. By H. R. Hall. 1914.

Syria, and on Cults and Myths, which form a considerable, and not the least interesting, portion of M. Dussaud's book, have no counterpart in that of Mr. Hall.

On the other hand, the English volume, strange to say, displays much better proportion, and a much more useful grouping of material. This is what one is accustomed rather to expect from a French author; but there is no denying the fact that M. Dussaud has been rather overburdened with his material. At this time of day it is scarcely possible to see so clearly the bearings of much that has been discovered in the Ægean as to enable the discoveries to be grouped, each in its proper place, and presented, each in its true proportion and relation. The consequence is that M. Dussaud, anxious to leave nothing out, has presented his readers with an enormous mass of details which sometimes, like the ancient art with which he deals, is lacking in perspective. Again and again, in his otherwise most interesting volume, it is the old story of not being able to see the wood for the trees. Mr. Hall has avoided this difficulty by a more rigid self-denial and restraint in the selection of his material; and he has his reward, for one is never at a loss to see the bearing of his material on his story.

Altogether, these two volumes have now done for the present day what the *Mycenæan Age* of Tsountas and Manatt, and Mr. Hall's earlier volume *The Oldest Civilization of Greece* did for the days before the Cretan explorations of Sir Arthur Evans and the Italian mission under Dr. Halbherr.

It is, of course, quite needless to attempt any description of the civilization whose relics, so sadly mutilated, and yet so infinitely suggestive, are here detailed and pictured. The general outlines of the facts which came to light as Schliemann, and after him Dörpfeld and Tsountas unveiled the civilization known to the end of last century as Mycenæan, and Evans, Halbherr, and Seager followed with the revelation of the earlier and nobler Minoan culture of Crete—these outlines are far too familiar to require any redrawing. Everybody knows now that instead of ancient civilization, in the world that counts in classical antiquity, being limited to the two great rival cultures of the Nile and Euphrates valleys, we have to make room in our scheme of history for a third culture, probably quite as ancient as that of either Egypt or Babylonia, quite as remarkable, at least in many of its developments, as either of its contemporaries, and with elements in it which make it even more interesting to us, from some points of view, than the cultures of the two great river valleys can ever be. For the Island Civilization which had grown old and passed away long before the Homeric Period was the mother of all that wonder of art and literature which we know as Greek culture; and while the Hellenes, no doubt, owed a vast deal to the sterner strain of Achæan and Dorian blood whose union with the conquered Minoans bore the fruit of Hellenism, they owed not less to the softer, swifter, subtler, and more beauty-loving genius of the older race.

Some day, perhaps, exploration will give us the materials, and fortune give us the genius capable of grouping them all in their true relations and weaving them into a connected story. And then we shall have the most wonderful romance in the whole history of the human race, telling us how it came to pass that by the union of the brilliant and unrestrained genius of the Minoan with the sterner and more austere force of the conquering races there came into the world the Greek as we see him in history, literature, and art. Meanwhile, we can only wonder at the mysterious alchemy by which the daring and adventurous art of Crete, sometimes overflowing, in the fulness of its life, into what we can only call bad taste and gaudiness, was curbed and refined until its motto became 'nothing in excess' and its representatives were Pheidias and Praxiteles, Lysippus and Ictinus.

In the presence of the great art of Mesopotamia, and even more of Egypt, one feels that here is something which, however splendid, will reach, or perhaps even has reached, a conclusion, and has nothing more to say; but the art of the Minoan, with all its crudities and imperfections, is seminal, with all the promise of the future in it—a future whose splendour we now can realize. The frescoes of Knossos are the work of artistic genius absolutely untrammelled, and only feeling its way, through excesses and in spite of occasional lapses of taste, to something great; the Parthenon Friezes or the Apoxyomenos represent the attainment towards which the unknown Minoan was striving. Curiously enough, as one looks at the reproductions in either of these volumes—the Hunting-Cat Fresco—the famous Cup-Bearer—the Silver Vase fragment from Mycenæ, and contrasts them with

fifth-century Greek work, the art that is really a millennium older appears infinitely more modern, in spite of its faults of execution—perhaps because we moderns too, like the Minoan, are struggling in our day towards something that we do not as yet fully understand, and cannot adequately express.

It is the same with Ægean architecture. Here, of course, we are hampered by the fact that, save at Knossos and, in a less degree, at Phaistos, we have scarcely more than outlines and basements to guide us. Yet it seems fairly evident that the Minoan architect, like the Minoan artist, had a superabundance of vigour and idea, but had still to learn how to group and proportion his conceptions. Probably the palace of Knossos, with all its splendour, would strike us, could we have seen it in its glory, as, in one sense, barbaric; it has been variously described as something on the lines of a Thibetan Lamassery or a Greek monastery. The life and the power were there; but the absorbingly interesting question is: How were they chastened and subdued, till the Parthenon or the Theseium took the place of Knossos and Phaistos?

How wonderful this Ægean civilization was, is seen, of course, mainly in the Cretan discoveries at Knossos, Phaistos, and Hagia Triada, where the Minoan palaces have yielded up the wrecks of their ancient treasures, and at Gournia, Palaikastro, Zakro, Mokhlos, and Pseira, where the relics of the middle-class, the business and seafaring section of the Minoan community have come to light. M. Dussaud's chapters on the Cyclades, the Troad, Cyprus, and continental Greece only serve to deepen the impression of the overpowering originality and dominance of Crete. They preserve the balance, in a sense, by reminding us of what we are apt to forget under the spell of the Cretan discoveries, that other Ægean lands shared largely in the same civilization; but, all the same, there is no mistaking the supremacy of Crete. The Cyclades yield much; but the best of their art is obviously inspired from Crete in those cases where it is not of direct importation. (Mr. Hall holds the famous flying-fish fresco of Phylakopi in Melos to be a Cretan work of art imported by a Melian grandee.) Even in continental Greece, the best of the treasures, such as the Vaphio cups, are of Cretan origin. And as for Cyprus, to whose awkward and clumsy perversions of Cretan ideas M. Dussaud devotes a long chapter much of whose space might have been better employed, she apparently would scarcely have had anything worth calling civilization or art, had it not been for comparatively late borrowings from her sister island—which she did her best to spoil when she got them.

The impression gathered from the whole mass of work left behind by the Ægean race, whether it worked in the flush of its youth and vigour in Crete, in the golden days before the overthrow of the great sea-empire of Knossos, or with lessening vigour and decaying taste in the other islands and on the mainland sites after the great catastrophe, is that of a people of astonishing mental agility, alert and sensitive in a high degree to original ideas, extraordinarily modern in many of their views—as to cleanliness and sanitation, for example, to say nothing of the dress of their womenkind. In some respects it almost seems as though the Minoan of the 15th century B.C. were nearer to us in his habit of life than our own ancestors of the 18th century A.D. Certainly, if Knossos be the test, he was a cleaner creature than they. Instinctively one feels the suggestion of France and French feeling and genius in much of the work of the Minoans. There is a daintiness, a quick fancy, and a lightness of touch about the Ægean artist, which are thoroughly French, so that one feels it only natural that the Minoan ladies should have worn the low-necked gowns with wasp waists and many flounces which suggest the court of the Second Empire rather than anything Greek or Oriental.

No doubt behind all the brightness and the love of beauty, so manifest upon the surface, there was a darker side to the Minoan character. The old classical legends attest the existence of this more sinister aspect of this ancient civilization. The Minotaur, whatever be the real origin of the legend, belonged to a race which had left a mark of cruelty and terror upon the imagination of the ancient Ægean world; while the Bull-grappling frescoes suggest a good deal of callousness in respect of human suffering, whether we are to regard this *ταυροκαθάψια* as a religious rite or not. There are seal-impressions from Zakro and elsewhere which reveal a strange, weird, unpleasant twist in the Minoan nature. The Egyptian combinations of animal head and human body in the images of some of their gods are bad enough; but they are restrained and dignified compared with some of the figures of nightmare that are seen on M.

Dussaud's pages. There was something perverted and unhealthy in the fancy that designed such monsters, whether their significance was sacred or merely fantastic. Yet, all the same, to turn from the reliefs of an Assyrian palace to the frescoes of Knossos is like turning from a shambles to a green meadow in spring-time. The Assyrian was a magnificent and cultured brute, the Minoan was a true artist.

On the question of the language of this remarkable race, M. Dussaud does not give us much enlightenment. Nor, unfortunately, does it seem as though much will ever be done in this direction, abundant though the materials are, until the discovery of a bilingual text. Such a thing ought to be quite within the bounds of possibility. The relations between Crete and Egypt were close and intimate for many centuries, and it would seem by no means unlikely that bilingual copies of treaties, commercial or otherwise, between the two empires, should have been in existence. Meanwhile the Minoan tablets remain alongside the Hittite inscriptions—a standing provocation. The attempts that have been made to read either them or the curious inscriptions, evidently from a foreign source, on the Phaistos disk, do not inspire confidence.

The chapters of M. Dussaud's book to which the average reader will turn with greatest expectation are those on Ægean influence in Egypt and Syria, and on Cults and Myths. Unfortunately the result is rather disappointing than otherwise. Particularly is this the case with regard to the Egyptian section of the former chapter. M. Dussaud begins his discussion of Ægean influence by saying that the Cretan genius has been fertilized by Egyptian Art, and, further, that there is evidence in the record of the development of the Ægean marine, that the relations between the two civilizations were reciprocal. In this there can be no doubt that he is absolutely right; and such statements made with such emphasis, lead one to expect a correspondingly full treatment of these relations, in regard to which we have fuller evidence than exists for any other races or lands with which the Ægean civilization had touch. Instead, we get a miserable eight pages, or rather less, of which a considerable portion is occupied with illustrations, none too happily chosen, and in which there occur such statements as that the Ægean races are mentioned in the Egyptian texts from the time of the first dynasty under the name of *Hanebu*. No evidence is produced for this statement, which is open to very grave question. On the other hand, M. Dussaud appears to attach singularly little importance to the actual discoveries of early dynastic Egyptian stoneware in Crete, and of black incised pottery of apparently Ægean origin in Egypt — a far more significant matter than questionable references.

Nor are the later relations handled in a much more satisfactory manner. In dealing with the period of the Empire, the author naturally discusses the famous representations of Keftiu in the tombs of Sen-mut, Rekhmara, and Men-khepera-senb, and accepts the general identification of these foreign tribute bearers with the men of Minoan Crete, regarding Keftiu, Kaphtor, and Crete as one and the same. So far good; but M. Dussaud is not entitled to evade the difficulties of this probably perfectly accurate theory as he does. When the figures, not only of Cretan Keftiu, but of Syrian Retennu, are represented bearing manifestly Ægean vessels, it is not sufficient to explain this fact by the suggestion that the Egyptian artist often put more haste than conscience into his work. Surely in this case it is the modern writer rather than the ancient artist who is hasty. If he had been speaking of illuminations for a commercial copy of the Book of the Dead the remark might have passed; but it is rash to assume that the Theban tomb-paintings, the most priceless contemporary documents for the appearance and garb of these ancient races, are carelessly handled. So far as can be judged by comparisons of Cretan frescoes, the Egyptian artist was as careful as could reasonably be expected. Moreover, M. Dussaud's hasty remark has a double edge. If the tomb-paintings are not good evidence in the case of the Retennu, can we assume that they are good evidence in that of the Keftiu? If the facts will not square in every detail with the theory, surely it is safer to admit the slight discrepancy, and to inquire whether some modification of the theory may not be required, and whether the apparent inconsistency may not lead to a fuller knowledge of the wider extension of Ægean influence.

In the discussion of Syrian relations, the most interesting point is, of course, the question of the Philistines. There are few things more remarkable than the way in which Archæology has come to the rescue of the reputation of Israel's ancient

enemies, and, by associating them with the remnants of the wrecked Minoan culture, has shown us that they were far from being the uncultured barbarians of current imagination, but, on the contrary, were a race more highly civilized and more advanced than the Israelites against whom they fought. The identification seems now to have practically passed into the realm of accepted fact, though there are still some who question it, and though the argument from the resemblance of the feather head-dress of the Pulusati in the Medinet Habu reliefs of Ramses III. to that of the heads on the Phaistos disk is scarcely one to be pressed, even in the guarded form in which M. Dussaud presents it, in view of the probability that the Phaistos disk is not a native Cretan piece of work. Assuming that the identification of the Zakkaru with the Cretans of Zakro is to hold, we must conclude that from shortly after 1200 B.C. the entire coastland of Palestine from Dor southwards was in the hands of a race of Cretan origin, the inheritor of the great Minoan tradition, which had been driven originally from its home by the great catastrophe of Knossos in 1400 B.C., and after long wanderings had at last found a resting-place.

Mr. Macalister has aptly pointed out the curious inversion, in the encounter of Israelite and Philistine, of what we are accustomed to consider the normal relation between East and West; the Western race, in this instance, being the one with the great historic past and the old tradition, while the Eastern was, comparatively speaking, of yesterday.

M. Dussaud recognizes the repute of the Philistines as redoubtable soldiers, a repute probably due, in the main, to their possession of superior arms, the passage 1 S $13^{19ff.}$ seeming to indicate that they jealously guarded for themselves the newly realized advantages of iron weapons. Apart from this advantage, it is difficult to see wherein their superiority can have consisted. Certainly not in physique, where the advantage probably lay on the other side. M. Dussaud cites Goliath; but there is no evidence that Goliath was of the same origin as the men on whose side he fought. Rather the special way in which he and his gigantic brethren are mentioned points to their having been the descendants of an older race of larger frame which had been absorbed by the Cretan conquerors. All the evidence points in the direction of the Ægean race having been one of comparatively small men, relying more upon quickness and alertness of brain than upon brute force.

Though, as M. Dussaud observes, the Philistines seem to have almost entirely abandoned their old island gods in favour of the gods of their new home, Dagon, Ashtoreth, and Baalzebub, yet traces of the ancient Cretan influence survive. The votive offerings of the golden tumours and golden mice which accompanied the ark on its return from Philistia come from the same stock as the votive figures and limbs of Petsofa and the offerings of the Dictæan Cave.

There remains the still very obscure question of the Ægean Religion. M. Dussaud's chapter on this subject is probably the most valuable part of his volume, not for any constructive effort at an outline of the religion, but for the fact that it gathers together practically every detail that has been discovered with regard to Ægean belief and worship. In the five sections of a very long chapter the author deals with Places of Worship, Cult Objects, Idols and Ritual Gestures, Myths and Legends, and Worship of the Gods and of the Dead; and the diligence with which he has assembled his material is worthy of all praise. At the same time, this is still only a stone-heap for the future builder. The chapter is a great collection of facts about certain gods and certain acts of worship; but no attempt has been made to create a picture of a religion. That, of course, is no fault of the author, for as yet no picture seems to be possible.

We vaguely discern a faith in which the supreme deity was not a god, but a goddess, a Great Mother, source of all life, human and animal alike, and into which a secondary male deity was introduced, at a later date, and perhaps by a conquering race, and was united in a sacred marriage to the original mother goddess. To the goddess various creatures are specially sacred—the dove, often perched upon her head; the lion, posed on either side of her as a guardian,—supremely the serpent, to which, as a Chthonic deity, she has close affinity, and which is represented, as at Gournia and in the faience figures of Knossos, twisted round her arms. The sacred animal of the minor male deity is apparently the bull, and his emblem is the Double Axe.

Worship is conducted originally in sacred caverns, such as the grotto of Psychro—the Dictæan Cave

—sacrifice and libation being part of the ritual. Later, the cave sanctuary becomes transformed into the household sanctuary which is characteristic of Cretan religion. There are no temples in existence, but only small shrines. Several of these have been found in the Cretan palaces; while it has been suggested that the whole structure of such buildings as the palaces of Knossos and Phaistos partook of a sacred character, and that the great width of the superb staircases was due to the fact that they were used for processional services. Dr. Mackenzie has stated that the tendency at Knossos was for each house to have its own shrine, and M. Dussaud concurs: 'It is probable that each dwelling possessed a place consecrated to private worship.' This is one of the distinguishing features characteristic of what Professor Petrie very truly calls 'the refreshing originality of Crete.' Minoan worship was family worship. Another feature is the prominence of women in acts of worship. It cannot be said with certainty that the Minoan worship was conducted by priestesses instead of priests; but certainly women are far more prominent than men in the various representations of ritual—particularly, *e.g.*, on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus to which M. Dussaud devotes considerable space.

In dealing with Cult Objects, the author shows, as he has done more or less throughout the volume, a decided prejudice against the idea of Pillar-worship among the Minoans. The vigour with which he presses his denial of the baetylic character of the various Minoan pillars hitherto assumed to have a sacred significance is almost in inverse proportion to the amount of evidence which he brings against the views of Sir Arthur Evans (*Mycenæan Tree and Pillar Cult*); and in some cases, as in dealing with the pillars which have the goddess's special emblem of the dove perched upon them, his argument amounts only to looking the difficulty boldly in the face and passing by on the other side. Again, the eagerness to discard the pillar as a sacred emblem goes, curiously enough, along with a desire to assume the sacredness of the spiral, which seems to have less evidence in its favour. 'One feels,' says M. Dussaud, 'that it is not only its decorative value that has ensured its extreme diffusion: it had a particular value in the worship.' But why? One would naturally imagine that the decorative value of the spiral would ensure its wide diffusion from the moment that it was first realized by so artistic a race, quite apart from any question of religious significance. This, however, is a trifling blemish upon a chapter which is by far the fullest extant collection of material for the study of Ægean religion, and which is marked besides by a very refreshing sanity and common sense in its dealing with some of the problems raised.

Unfortunately in both volumes the date of publication has hindered the inclusion of any reproduction or notice of what is probably (if its genuineness be finally attested) the most remarkable work of Minoan art so far known to exist. This is the ivory and gold image of the Snake Goddess which has recently come into the possession of the Boston Museum, U.S.A.; and which has been reproduced in the *Bulletin* of the Museum, and in Professor Petrie's quarterly, *Ancient Egypt* (Part ii., 1915). As an idol, this extraordinary little figure merely repeats the ideas of the familiar snake goddesses of Knossos; but as a work of art it is altogether unique. Mr. Hall speaks of students of Greek religion gasping at the faience figures of the snake goddesses. But should the Boston statuette be finally accepted as a genuine piece of Minoan work, students of Greek art will be left still more breathless when they see details of the representation of the human face which were believed not to have been realized till the 4th century B.C., anticipated by the Minoan artist at least a thousand years before. I say nothing of the divine lady's Parisian gown, which is neither more nor less than an intelligent anticipation of the fashions of the present spring, only much more gracefully carried out.

JAMES BAIKIE.

Edinburgh.

Contributions and Comments.

St. Paul's Imprisonment at Rome and the Text of the Acts.

An authority on New Testament Textual Criticism[1] has justly remarked that even the most modest effort to elucidate the formation of the Western text of the Lukan writings is helpful as a clue to the key of the whole history of the New Testament. It would, doubtless, be idle to expect a perfect solution capable of explaining all the peculiarities of the text, just as it would be highly presumptuous to imagine that one is free to evolve a general theory out of the probability furnished by a variant or set of variants. It is beyond question that while the readings of the Western text afford indications of deliberate revision, they never show signs of any plan of coherent and continuous execution. They are rather the work of many hands employed in various places and at different times. Hence a prudent criticism of the text should rest content with the possible genesis of individual variants, leaving to a riper age of Textual Criticism the task of accounting for the text as a whole.

A variant little if at all taken into account in striking the balance between the two texts of the Acts, is that found in ch. 28^{16}. Yet examined in the light furnished by archæological data it would seem to be of great value—so great, in fact, as to afford fresh evidence of the deformed and derived nature of the Western text (numbered δ by Kenyon) as compared with the Eastern text (β).

In its twofold forms this verse presents important points of divergence which may be outlined as follows :—

β (recension represented by codices ℵABC; versions and Alexandrine Fathers): *ὅτε δὲ εἰσήλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ἐπετράπη τῷ Παύλῳ μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ.*

δ (recension represented by codex D, according to the substantially exact reconstruction of the missing part of it, taken from Ac 22^{29}, to end; some codices of the *Itala*, the *Versio Syriaca posterior sive Philoxeniana correcta*, Cyprian, the *Speculum*; and, in mixed form, by the *Gigas Latinus Stockholmiensis* of the thirteenth century): *ὅτε δὲ ἤλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ[-χῳ], τῷ Παύλῳ ἐπετράπη μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν (ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς) σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ.*—Cum venissemus autem Romam, centurio tradidit custodius *principi peregrinorum*; permissum autem Paulo forus manere extra castra, custodientibus eum militibus.

To form a correct estimate of the respective values of these two recensions and of the possible relations existing between them, it is advisable to take as a starting-point certain conclusions, now admitted to be sound, on the subject of the origin and function of the *Peregrini*.

Existing inscriptions show that, dating from the times of Hadrian, the office of purveyors to the imperial household, previously entrusted to freedmen, came to an end and passed into the hands of a special body known as the *Frumentarii*, taken promiscuously from the various legions, with Rome as centre, and intended to do for the imperial household all the commissariat work previously done by the other *Frumentarii* in the service of the armies scattered over the different military stations. To this body Septimius Severus gave a stricter organization, with quarters (*castra*) on the Celian Hill. Ere long the functions of purveying become transformed into those of a police force, with the added *metier* of spying. And under these circumstances it is easy to imagine that the body of *Frumentarii* were not looked upon with much sympathy by the bantering population of Rome, who treated them as outsiders and gave them the name of *Peregrini*.[2]

Examined in the light of these data, the text of Ac 28^{16} absolutely cannot be taken as an example of the origin of the *Frumentarii*, as has been done by Mommsen and Huelsen. On the contrary, it must be viewed in the light of the data furnished by existing inscriptions bearing on the subject. And this being so, it indubitably stands forth as a gloss, the recension of which and its insertion in the Lukan text must be assigned to a period when the work of political spies as well as of instruments of persecution was discharged as a matter of duty

[1] Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.*, p. 361.

[2] R. Paribeni, 'Dei Milites Frumentarii e dell' Approvvigionamento della Corte Imperiale,' in *Bull. dell' Istituto Arcaeologico*, Sez. Rom. xx. 310.

by the *Peregrini*, that is to say, between the times of Marcus Aurelius and those of Decius.

Not only this, but the unknown writer of the gloss would seem to have laboured under the influence of feelings different to some extent from those that animated the author of the Acts, who always made it a point not to drag the imperial authority into the first outbursts of anti-Christian persecution; whereas according to the gloss in question the prisoner Paul is directly handed over to the custody of the *Peregrini*, a body of imperial spies, as a man of mark, but one to be labelled dangerous and seditious.

Are there to be found in the text other variants tending to confirm the existence of similar anti-imperial sentiments in the anonymous glosser? I have already remarked that it is impossible to look for one single explanation of the modifications met with in the text and that several individuals must have been responsible for their existence. I have endeavoured to discover some of these and to study them along the lines of a possible psychological basis. Amongst the rest, I have been struck with the apparently significant variants in the discourse of Gamaliel in the Sanhedrim wherein (Ac 5^{39}) to the celebrated phrase, 'If the work of the Apostles be of God you cannot overwhelm or demolish it,' text δ adds: 'neither you nor kings nor tyrants': *οὔτε ὑμεῖς, οὔτε βασιλεῖς, οὔτε τύραννοι.* Have we not here the echo of an imperial persecution?

In Ac 5^{29}, too, it would appear as if text δ expresses the command of obedience to God, with marked energy that is not without significance: *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν· τίνι πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ, θεῷ ἢ ἀνθρώποις; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· θεῷ.*

Moreover, it is worthy of note that if the gloss in Ac 28^{16} thus accurately reflects the military organization of Rome about a century and a half after the imprisonment of St. Paul, and seems to furnish complementary if tardy data to the scanty information given by the primitive Lukan text, the thought naturally arises that the writer of that precise gloss must have been familiar with Rome. Now it will not be out of place to remember that the principal representative of text δ of the Acts, the famous codex D, affords, together with the Latin version, highly probable indications of a Western origin, South Italian, perhaps, or Gallic. True, codex D is not earlier than the fifth or sixth century, but it certainly had behind it an indigenous Western tradition.

Finally, the Latin or Roman origin of the gloss in Ac 28^{16} would help to explain the Greek word *στρατοπεδάρχης*, which in this connexion has always been a puzzle. That in codex D the Latin language has exercised a profound influence on the Greek was maintained by Rendel Harris, denied by Gregory, and reaffirmed by Soden. To this hypothesis our text, if examined in the light of the facts already set forth, offers a new confirmation hitherto neglected or unknown.

In fact the appellative *στρατοπεδάρχης* is completely absent from the pages of the New Testament and primitive Christian literature. There are only two instances of its use in Eusebius (*H.E.* viii. 4. 2; ix. 5. 2) in passages untranslated by Rufinus, where, referring to the persecution under Diocletian and precisely to the repressive measures taken against the Christian soldiers, the Bishop of Cæsarea uses the word to allude in a general way to the principal authority in the army. The Latin and Greek terms do not correspond absolutely. The Latin is more specific; the Greek indefinite. It would seem only logical to think that the writer simply passed on from the former to the latter, in the absence of a more definite term, unless indeed we are to suppose that *στρατοπεδάρχης*, literally *Princeps Castrorum*, indicated by antonomasia the *princeps* of those *Castra peregrinorum*, the inhabitants of which, as a consequence of their unlovely profession as spies, were an object of closer and less favourable interest than the other soldiers, to the gossiping, restless Rome of Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, and Decius.

ERNESTO BUONAIUTI.

Rome.

Amos vi. 5.

THE first word of this verse (הפרטים) has been regarded as of uncertain meaning. Various renderings have been suggested. They can be divided into two classes. Some commentators (as Driver, Marti, Nowack, Wellhausen) favour the rendering 'Those who sing, who improvise idly,' assuming that הפרטים refers to those who sing to the sound of the harp. Other commentators render this word by 'Those who tear (strike) the strings across the opening of the harp' (Hoffmann, Vollers, Siegfried). See, for both views and the different etymological explanations underlying them, Driver, *Amos*, p. 194 and p. 236;

Harper, *Amos*, p. 148 and p. 150; Marti, *Dodekapropheton*, p. 201; also the *Oxford* (Gesenius) *Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 827. Both renderings are already to be found in Ḳimḥi, *ad loc.*

The first rendering ('to sing,' 'to improvise idly') seems to me entirely inadmissible by reason of the context. The words על פי הנבל point to playing only, not to singing to the sound of the harp. The second rendering gives a better sense. But 'to tear the strings' is not satisfactory, as הפרטים is followed immediately by על פי הנבל. If the object had been the strings we would have expected a word for strings after הפרטים.

It seems to me that פרט means here 'to divide.' פרט, in the meaning 'to divide,' 'to separate,' occurs frequently in Talmudic Hebrew. Cf. Levy, *Neuhebr. u. chald. Wörterbuch*, Part IV., p. 110; see also the *Oxford Lexicon*, *l.c.* And I think that the 'dividing' refers here to *the fingers of the player*. When the musician played on the harp he did so by dividing his fingers and guiding them over the strings of the harp. 'To divide (the fingers)' therefore meant 'to play.' פרט, I venture to suggest, was then used in the same sense as נגן, and probably was a technical term for 'playing' on the harp. The word הפרטים has therefore to be rendered simply 'those who play.' The use of על פי הנבל instead of על הנבל is apparently due to the fact that the fingers touched the mouth, *i.e.* the strings of the harp, and not the whole harp.

The meaning of הפרטים thus becomes perfectly clear, etymologically and technically.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

Aramaic Incantation Texts.[1]

THE Aramaic Incantation Texts, published by Professor Montgomery, are a selection from the Museum Collection of the University of Pennsylvania. The bowls on which they are written were discovered in the upper strata at Nippur, and the texts are similar to others already published. Professor Montgomery has made use of this pre-existing material, improving in many ways upon the readings and interpretation given, while he has succeeded in placing these texts more exactly in relation to magical literature as a whole. He has selected forty texts for decipherment, transliteration, translation, and commentary, all drawn from a single locality, yet such is the mode of treatment that the impression is given of a detailed and comprehensive survey of the whole field of incantation literature.

Three Aramaic dialects and scripts appear, namely, 'Rabbinic' (in use among Jews in Babylonia), Syriac, and Mandaic. In transcription these have been reduced to a common form in the ordinary Hebrew characters, but the facsimiles are also presented in the plates. The contents of these non-literary texts are not of much intrinsic value, but with Professor Montgomery's introduction and comments they assume no slight measure of importance for those interested in the history of religions and in Early Church History, while students of Scripture will welcome the light they cast on many passages of the O.T. and N.T. It is said that Scripture quotation and reference are lacking in these Nippur bowls (p. 63), but this does not apply to Professor Montgomery's edition of them, since at least one hundred references to the O.T. and N.T. occur in the introduction (pp. 1–116), and one hundred and twenty in the commentary to individual texts. Several glossaries have been prepared, but we miss an index to passages of Scripture, which is worthy of a place considering the number of quotations and the importance of many of the references. In this connexion it may be remarked that of the volumes hitherto published by the Pennsylvania Museum authorities this one under review appears to have the most direct bearing on the Bible.

The purpose of the bowls is primarily to serve as a 'domestic phylactery,' to be classed with the abundant forms of this species of magic, *e.g.* the Jewish Mezuzoth (p. 43). They are made out in the name of private individuals, and the charm is supposed to cover a married couple, their children, their house, and their property, cattle, etc. A few are more specific in their purpose. What is written on the bowl is the main thing, the emphasis being placed on the power of the 'word' or 'name.' The praxis is not what it used to be in the days of Babylonian sorcery, although Professor Montgomery finds a virtue in the inverted position of the bowl or bowls, this symbolizing and effecting the repression and suppression of the evil spirits

[1] University of Pennsylvania, The Museum; Publications of the Babylonian Section, vol. iii. *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*, by James A. Montgomery. Pp. 315 Plates XLI. Philadelphia, 1913.

(p. 42). In certain cases they were bound and sealed in the four corners of the house, the bowls being quadrupled and provided with an identical inscription, for which usage we are invited to compare the cylinder and prism texts deposited at the four corners of great buildings in ancient Mesopotamia. One is tempted further to compare the 'lamp and bowl' deposits in the foundations of Palestinian houses, usually in the form of a lamp within a bowl with another bowl superimposed. Such deposits are presently reckoned to be a survival of the barbarous practice of foundation-sacrifice, but, making due allowance for the interval of nearly two millennia that lies between, we may perhaps see in them the prototype, at least so far as the praxis is concerned, of the bowls deposited at Nippur and elsewhere in Babylonia.

The bowls are dated by Professor Montgomery at *c.* 600 A.D. He regards them as almost the earliest records in that line that can be exactly dated.

The magic of the bowls appears to be only a degenerate survival of more vigorous forms previously current throughout the Ancient East. The evil spirits (*e.g.* Liliths), the evil agencies, and the natural evils, which form the three chief sections of the magical texts, are still present, but the demons are time-worn and banal, and the spirit of the whole is *fin de siècle*. Working back to the origins and relations of the Bowl Magic, Professor Montgomery has much of interest to tell us (p. 110 ff.). He finds Egypto-Hellenistic magic is one of the prime sources of these texts, and the impression made upon him by his study is that they resemble much more this form of magic (*i.e.* as found in papyri) than that of ancient Babylonia (*i.e.* as found in cuneiform tablets), although, it must be noted, the texts have been unearthed in Babylonia. Still Babylonian influence is undoubtedly felt, and also Jewish, only the Jews received more than they gave. At 600 A.D. the matter stands thus: Babylonian, Jewish, Mandaic, Gnostic, Hellenistic, and indirectly Egyptian, elements are there, in various combinations; while the product was useful to any body of magicians, even as it was in demand on the part of every class of client, pagans, Persians, Jews, Christians, every kind of sect (p. 115). The bowls are, therefore, not so much illustrative of a special Jewish magic—although often spoken of as Jewish—as of the eclectic religious conditions of later Mesopotamia. A remarkable feature noted in the absence of traces of the Zoroastrian system.

Such a highly specialized study, it may be judged, requires both intimate and extended knowledge, which, as is manifest upon every page, Professor Montgomery fully possesses. While experts will appreciate, as it deserves, the scholarly labour involved in the decipherment of the texts, and all that follows this, students at large, and especially students of the Bible, will be grateful for the illuminating and informative materials provided by the introduction. Professor Montgomery's contribution to the study of the wide field of magic, divination, and sorcery will have to be taken into account by future investigators, and they would do well to be guided by the cautious attitude of the writer, who, it may be said, is quite alive to the data already provided and to the immense advance recently made, and to keep in view these words: 'The study of magic is still in its beginnings, and students are too prone to find a genetic relation when we have to bear in mind that we are dealing with parallel workings of the human spirit operating in a universal and amazingly uniform field, while at the same time, particularly for the age when Hellenistic culture was dominant, we must give allowance for the interfusion of factors geographically most distant' (p. 110).

WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK.

Kinneff.

Genesis xiv. 14 (עד־דן).

IN this verse the Massoretic Text is to be suspected for 'internal' reasons. Professor Skinner writes: 'The name [Dan] originated in the period of the Judges (Jos 19^{47}, Jg 18^{29}); and it is singular that such a prolepsis should occur in a document elsewhere so careful of the appearance of antiquity' ('International Crit. Com.' on *Genesis*, p. 267).

Mr. H. M. Wiener, in *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 28, mentions that in the larger Cambridge Septuagint 'Dan' and 'Dathan' are recorded as variants. Though these of themselves give no suitable sense, their existence leads to the conclusion that the ordinarily received text of the LXX has been 'corrected' to bring it into harmony with M.T.; and they suggest a simple and wholly satisfactory conjectural emendation.

If we compare the letters of these variants, as

they would have appeared in the old Hebrew script, it is easy to see that both may have arisen from an original הם; a badly made ה or a ה partially illegible from long use of the MS. could easily be mistaken for ד or might even be incorrectly separated by a copyist into דת; and the old מ and נ were sufficiently alike to lead to a mistake in transcription.

We may therefore suppose that the original reading of this clause was וירדף עדהם = 'and he pursued until them,' *i.e.* until he caught them up. Cf. 2 K 9^{18}, בא המלאך עדהם = 'the messenger has come up to them,' *i.e.* has reached them. V.[15] is the natural sequence of the statement that he had caught them up.

It is to be noted as supporting this reading that רדף is usually followed by a direct accusative, or by a prepositional phrase introducing the object of the pursuit. In 1 S 20^{10} is the only other passage in the M.T. where a finite tense of the verb is used absolutely.

Further, only in this passage (Gn 14^{14}) does the M.T. use עד after רדף to introduce the place to which the pursuit was continued without the object having previously been mentioned.

In making these last two statements, I have followed the *Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance*. The two points are not essential to the acceptance of the suggested emendation; but if they are correct they strongly support it.

W. R. W. Gardner.

Zeitoun, Egypt.

'Likeness.'

Has it occurred to your readers how much is lacking of force and concreteness in our word 'likeness' as a translation of ὁμοίωμα as used by St. Paul? The characteristic English usage, 'a good likeness,' refers to a drawing or sculpture or photograph, something in a material usually quite different from that of the subject. But ὁμοίωμα seems to mean a copy or facsimile or replica, indistinguishable in substance from the original. I venture, therefore, to propose a slight change of idiom as the best way of representing the meaning of the Greek, as follows:—

Ro 1^{23} (allusion to Ps 106^{20}), 'exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image like the image of corruptible man, and birds, and quadrupeds, and reptiles.' An idol, though it claims to be something very different, is in the end no more than an image of man or beast. It may become grotesque or hideous in the attempt to depict superhuman traits, but succeeds only in being a copy of familiar forms.

Ro 5^{14}, 'that had not sinned with a transgression like Adam's.'

Ro 6^{5}, 'if we have become assimilated (to Christ) by a death like his, we shall be so also by a like resurrection to his.'

Ro 8^{3}, 'sending his own Son in flesh like the flesh of sin.' In outward appearance our Lord entirely resembled other men, though essentially so different from them.

Ph 2^{7}, 'but effaced himself in taking the form of a slave, becoming a man like (other) men.' (The literal translation of ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν in this verse, 'emptied himself,' always seems to me to raise unnecessary difficulties. The word is surely used in an advanced metaphorical sense just as in other places in the N.T., where it is rendered 'make void.')

The example in the Book of Revelation (9^{7}) is somewhat different from any of the above quoted, though the same method may be applied in translating it too: 'The things like locusts were like horses got ready for war.'

Alex. R. Mackenzie.

Yungling, Manchuria.

Entre Nous.

Illustrations from the War.

The Editor offers a set of the *Great Texts of the Bible* (twenty volumes), or their equivalent in other books chosen from Messrs. T. & T. Clark's catalogue, for the best series of illustrations of the Bible on religious and ethical topics from incidents connected with the War. He offers also a set of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible* (six volumes)—or their equivalent as before—for the second best series. The texts or topics illustrated should be given, and the source of the illustration, together with the date.

The illustrations should be sent before the end of August. They must refer to incidents occurring not earlier than February.

Prayer as a Pulpit Theme.

Some notes will be found elsewhere on the preaching of topics instead of texts. The Roman Catholic preacher seems to have just discovered the topic. In the end of last year a free translation was made, by Professor P. A. Beecher, of Father Schouppe's *Adjumenta Oratoris Sacri*, and was published under the title of *Pulpit Themes* (Gill; 7s. 6d. net). The demand was instantaneous and exhaustive. In six weeks the eleven hundred copies of the first edition were sold. What is the character of the book? In answer let us quote the complete treatment of one of the topics. Let us take Prayer.

PRAYER.

FIRST DISCOURSE.

General View.

We ought always to pray and not to faint.—Lk 18^{1}.

Prayer is so essential to religion that it is in a manner a compendium of all spirituality. The instinct for prayer is imprinted on the heart of man; so much so that even amongst pagan peoples there is not found a religion which does not insist on prayer.

The Christian religion especially is a religion of prayer. It commends nothing more earnestly than the exercise of prayer. Its Founder, Jesus Christ, was ever communing with His Father; whilst the Prophets, Apostles, and all the Saints were men of prayer.

Accordingly, he who has the spirit of prayer is truly religious, is truly a Christian, and will attain the promised rewards: so that it has come to be recognized that the spirit of prayer is a sign of predestination.

That we may more and more acquire this spirit, we shall consider:

I. THE EXCELLENCE OF PRAYER.
II. THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER.
III. THE NECESSITY OF PRAYER.
IV. THE PRACTICE OF IT.

I. THE EXCELLENCE OF PRAYER.

1. He who understands this will not ask why he should pray; but rather will exclaim: whence is it given to me that I can pray?

2. And well may he so exclaim, for prayer is a communion with God Himself. . . .

3. Like incense it ascends and floats before the throne of God, and has incense as its symbol: *Another angel came, and stood before the altar, having a golden censor; and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer of the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God* (Apoc. 8^{3}).

4. It is a connection or communication with heaven, having as another image the ladder of Jacob: *Our conversation is in heaven* (Phil. 3^{20}).

5. It is the language of the children of God. . . .

6. It is a certain sign of salvation.—But on the other hand, to quote the words of S. Bonaventure: *When I see a man not loving the exercise of prayer, not imbued with a fervent and vehement desire for it, and not caring to avail of the divine privilege of communion with God, I conclude that he is moulded of coarse and common clay—a man who, spiritually, is already dead.*

II. THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER.

1. It enriches with all good things, and delivers from all evils. . . . It obtains for us the things that are eternal, and the temporal in so far as they are to our advantage. . . . It delivers from evils, past, present, and to come; as well as from what afflicts us externally and internally, whether in body or in soul.

2. It is the key of heaven . . . Aug. serm. 229.

3. It is a golden chain let down from heaven to earth, by which graces are drawn from above, and souls are drawn from below.

[A well-known poet has said:

For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves, and those who call them friends!
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.]

4. It is an arrow that speeds through the heavens, and falls at the feet of God.

5. It is *the arrow of the Lord's deliverance* (4 K 13^{17})—the armour of the strong—the city of refuge. . . .

6. It is more powerful than armies in battle

array. . . . It is more powerful than the devil. Yes even it can conquer God Himself and make Him drop from His hands the thunderbolts of His justice. Of this we have a striking example in Exodus: *And the Lord said to Moses: Let me alone that my wrath may be kindled against them. . . . But Moses besought the Lord his God. . . . And the Lord was appeased from doing the evil which he had spoken against his people* (Ex 32^{10} and following).

7. The earth is fertile; but its fertility cannot be compared with the fruits of prayer. And this can be confirmed by testimony and example. . . .

III. Necessity of Prayer.

In the first place the misery with which we are clothed proves it— of ourselves we *are wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked.*

2. Then there is the will of God, which has decreed that prayer is necessary, by necessity of *precept* and *means*. The necessity of precept is evident from many texts of Scripture, by which we are commanded to pray: *Ask and it shall be given you* (Mt 7^{7}). *We ought always to pray, and not to faint* (Lk 18^{1}). The necessity of *means* is proved from the fact, on the one hand, that we need daily helps for our salvation, and, on the other, that God has decreed not to give them except to those who ask and pray. And God has so decreed because this is the only way of bringing home to us that our salvation and all good things come from Him; and because it is our only way of confessing our total dependence on Him, and of giving Him unceasing thanks. . . .

3. A father wishes that his children should ask him for good things; so too does God. . . .

4. As the earth, although most fertile, requires cultivation and irrigation, so the soul, no matter how otherwise well disposed, needs prayer. . . .

5. Prayer is the light of the soul,—its food,—and its respiration.

6. Prayer is the armour of God's soldier in the day of battle. . . .

7. Wherefore, he who prays shall want nothing, and shall rise superior to his enemies; but he who does not pray shall lack everything, and shall be the sport and mockery of his enemies.

IV. Practice of Prayer.

1. Prayer is easy. The slightest elevation of the soul to God—that is prayer. . . . Every beggar, every infant however weak, knows how to ask, and to make known what he desires; in like manner every one can pray, provided he realizes his want.

2. The characteristics or qualities of good prayer are: humility, confidence, and perseverance; and a necessary condition is recollection of the divine presence, *that one should by vivid faith prostrate oneself at the feet of the Lord, as a son at the feet of his father.*

3. What is necessary before, during, and after prayer? Before prayer, preparation; during prayer, piety; after prayer, harmony of life with the things sought for. . . .

4. Is prayer always heard? Yes, infallibly, if the conditions are fulfilled. . . . What are these conditions?

5. There are various classes of Christians in respect to prayer:—(1) There are those who do not pray; (2) those who pray badly; (3) those who pray well.

6. Why are so many not heard? . . . Frequently they ask for temporal things, without caring to detest their sins, and seek first the friendship of God. . . .

7. The different kinds of prayer are vocal, mental, ejaculatory. . . .

8. How are we to interpret the continuous prayer spoken of by Christ? (Lk 18^{1}).

9. It will be most helpful to explain in detail to the people the Lord's Prayer, and other forms of prayer.

10. How comes it that many cannot recite the Lord's Prayer without insincerity?

11. What are the impediments to prayer? How can they be removed? . . .

12. Our prayer should be addressed not only to God and Christ Jesus, but also to the Blessed Virgin Mary, to the Angels and Saints. . . .

Fellowship.

We have been much surprised to find ourselves caught by a book on the Pilgrim's Progress. Not that we thought we had exhausted the Pilgrim's Progress. But we did think we had got to the end of the good books on it. This is a small volume, one of Kelly's 'Manuals for Christian Thinkers.' Its title is *The Pilgrim Road* (1s. net), its author the Rev. W. B. Fitzgerald.

Besides its interest as an interpretation, the book is a perpetual stimulus to thought, especially if the

thinking mind is a preacher's. Here, for example, is something on Fellowship. The 'house' referred to is the Palace Beautiful, of course.

Within the house the great thought is *Fellowship*: fellowship here and now: fellowship with the past: and a joyous fellowship to look forward to in the future.

Christian, as soon as he enters, finds himself welcomed into a family. Friendship is the atmosphere of the place. He is no longer a lonely man, hunted by his sins and jeered at by his neighbours, but a member of a gracious household. All are interested in him, and cheer him by their conversation; and he is tactfully encouraged to tell the story of his own experiences.

This joyous fellowship reaches its climax in the communion of the Holy Supper. They sit down together to a common meal,

'*and all their talk at the Table was about the Lord of the Hill: about what He had done, and wherefore He did what He did, and why He had builded that House: and by what they said I perceived that He had been a great Warrior, and had fought with and slain him that had the power of Death, but not without great danger to Himself, which made me love Him the more.*'

The scene to Bunyan's mind is so vivid and moving that, in the last sentence, he unconsciously drops into the first person. He identifies himself with Christian.

But this was not all. On the following day Christian is taken into the Library and is shown the Records of the Past. From these he discovers that he is only one of 'a great multitude whom no man can number,' who once suffered as he has suffered, and found deliverance in the same Saviour. And their deeds of valour inspire him with high resolve. His devotion is enriched by the thought of his oneness with the Church of the past.

Then there is a fellowship yet to come. On the last morning he was taken to the top of the House, and away in the sunny south he saw 'a most pleasant Mountainous Country, beautified with woods, vineyards, fruits of all sorts; flowers also, with springs and fountains, very delectable to behold.' It was Immanuel's land, which after many strivings he would reach. Not the goal itself, but within sight of it. There, too, he will not be alone, for the Mountains are 'common to and for all Pilgrims.' It is a thought, sometimes a little overlooked, of the possibilities of the communion of saints in the closing years of life. 'From thence,' he is told, 'thou mayest see to the Gate of the Celestial City.'

Bunyan was in harmony with the New Testament in making Fellowship the central idea of the Church. Whatever else the Church may mean, this is essential.

When John Wesley was acting as curate to his father at Epworth he was told of a Lincolnshire villager who, even in those dark days, had won respect from his neighbours by reason of his goodness; and, ready as ever to learn even from the humblest, Wesley visited him. One sentence the old man spoke was never forgotten:

'*Sir, you wish to serve God and go to heaven. Remember, you cannot serve Him alone: you must therefore find companions or make them: the Bible knows nothing of solitary religion.*' The words went deep, and when the time came for Wesley to make provision for the spiritual needs of the awakened multitudes of the eighteenth century he made Fellowship the very foundation of the Methodist Society.

The place of fellowship is very forcefully presented by Phillips Brooks in *The Influence of Jesus*:

'Jesus begins with the individual. He always does. His first and deepest touches are on the single soul. Before all social life there is the personal consciousness and its mysterious private relations to the Father from whom it came.'

'But,' he continues, '*there are some things of the individual life which the individual cannot get save in the company of fellow-men.* There are some parts of his own true life always in his brethren's keeping, for which he must go to them. That the individual may find and be his own truest and fullest self, Jesus, his Master, leads him to his fellows.'

Those words go deep down to the philosophy of life, and in days when we are becoming more and more reticent in spiritual things they need to be carefully weighed. We join the Church, not merely for the sake of others, but also for our own sakes, because we, without them, cannot be perfected. The same thought is well expressed by Dr. Hunter in *The Coming Church*:

'The Christian disciple who has only heard the personal call of the Lord has heard but half of His message. 'Together in My name,' is also

a law of His order and way of life. His redeeming work begins with the single soul, but it does not end there. . . . The tie which relates us to Him also binds us to all His brethren, and gives us a sense of membership in a communion which is beyond all earthly banding and disbanding. In true fellowship with the Son of Man and the Son of God, we are in fellowship with the whole family of God on earth and in heaven.'

Dr. Hunter believes that on the foundation of such fellowship there may be built 'a Church large enough and broad enough to welcome and receive all disciples of Christ.' And he endeavours to describe it. 'A genuine Catholic Church—which in its terms of communion is as comprehensive as the Christian life—must have for its basis of union

'not uniformity of order and ritual,
'not views and opinions,
'not sameness of religious experience,
'but mutual spiritual sympathy, aspiration, and purpose—aspiration, not attainment; purpose, not character.'

And it will seek to meet and satisfy in and through its services of worship many and varied wants and sympathies and tastes; while its 'message' will be 'as large as the Gospel of Jesus Christ, glad tidings for all peoples.'

Such a Church may still be a dream, a vision of things to come. But it is very like the House Beautiful. And if ever it appears on earth we shall say, in phrases familiar in the Apostles' Creed, the Litany, and Te Deum, this is indeed the

Holy Catholic Church.
Thy Holy Church Universal.
The Holy Church throughout the world.

TWO POETS.

Stephen Southwold.

Mr. Southwold is not a great poet, and he knows it. But he is a poet. He is not overjoyed to write down the obvious in lines of irregular length; he has felt. What he says is his own, gained by some sacrifice. See him in the poem on

THE FACE OF GOD.

My fetters snapt, and my immanacled soul
Stood free. Then upward streaming from its cell
Burst this terrene control.
I watched the level earth's grey bosom swell
Beneath me till it fell
Under my feet a spinning point of light:
The unnumbered planets streamed
Gold motes across the universal night,
And faintly gleamed
A waning radiance: the vast mantle interknit
With cosmic light grew dark; and round me prest,
In void made manifest,
The unfathomable blackness of the infinite.

Meseemed all time passed like a wing's swift beat,
And I was cold and desolate with dread,
And in my head
The eternal silence cried; and everywhere
Was God: such peace enwrapt my every sense,
With His own immanence,
That all my soul became a breathing prayer
About His judgment-seat.

And a great light shone, and from the deep beneath
The beamy planets and star-dust updrew
Into its spreading glory, and became
An ordered part
Of that white sacred Flame
Whose inmost heart
Held all things: from the radiance a breath
Of quiet sound like a soft murmur grew
Into a swelling song, wherein the fire
Of every rapt and tremulous cadence sang,
Till the illumed and infinite spaces rang
With whispering echoes of divine Desire.

The title of the book is *The Common Day* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net).

Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

In Mrs. Wilcox's *Poems of Optimism* (Gay & Hancock; 1s. net) there is much variety—variety of metre and of merit. It is not the most pleasing of the volumes which we have seen, though there are pleasing poems in it. The subject of Divorce is dealt with three or four times and the seamy side exhibited. The title is not always applicable, but it is applicable to this short poem on

REWARD.

Fate used me meanly; but I looked at her and laughed,
That none might know how bitter was the cup I quaffed.
Along came Joy, and paused beside me where I sat,
Saying, 'I came to see what you were laughing at.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is it still possible to pray for rain?

There are those who tell us it is possible still but it will not be possible long. It is possible still, they say, because the laws which govern the weather are not all ascertained yet. But they are being gradually discovered. And when they are all discovered we shall be able to predict the rain as certainly as we predict an eclipse of the sun. Then it will not be possible to pray for rain.

Mr. S. A. McDowall, in his new book on *Evolution and Spiritual Life* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 6s. net), discusses the possibility of prayer for rain. He does not use that argument. He sees some difficulties in the way of prayer for rain. But they have nothing to do with the laws of nature. They are not scientific; they are philosophical, as are all the problems that we are now most perplexed with.

Some things are clear. It is clear that our mind affects our body—influences and modifies it directly. It is also clear that our mind *may* mediate a change in matter outside our own body. Whereupon a third thing is clear—that no distinction can be drawn between answers to prayer involving mind and answers to prayer involving matter.

But there are two kinds of matter. There is matter which is animated by mind, and there is matter which is not animated by mind. We may be able to influence the body of another because it is animated by its own mind. Can we also influence the clouds which are not so animated? We may by prayer be able to raise another from a bed of sickness. Can we also darken the sky with clouds and bring down rain on the thirsty land?

The answer is that we should never dream of such a thing. It is not to the clouds we pray, any more than it is to our sick friend's body. It is to God, the healer of the one, the upholder of the other. Mr. McDowall sticks to matter, because, to his philosophical mind, matter is God's self-limitation. 'Without irreverence,' he calls it 'the material Body of the Immanent God' and says that it 'constitutes part of His immediate experience.' To interfere with the rain is therefore to interfere with the will of God which originally brought about the self-limitation.

Well, after all, he comes to the will of God, as we must always come. It is not whether we can influence matter, with or without mind, directly or indirectly. That is not prayer. It is whether we can influence the will of God. If prayer cannot do that, it can do nothing. If it can do that, it can do all things.

Now it is impossible to see how prayer can influence the will of God. But it is quite certain that it does so. What do we mean by influencing God's will? We possibly mean no more, but we certainly mean no less, than that which the Syrophœnician woman accomplished with the will of Christ. To say that that woman did not influence the will of Christ is to say that 'He was pretending all the time.' Why it had to be done, we cannot tell. Nor can we tell how she did it, except that she did it by the greatness of her faith. But so it is always. 'Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do what is done to the fig tree, but even if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea, it shall be done. And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive' (Mt $21^{21.22}$).

Professor E. A. Sonnenschein, of the University of Birmingham, is not content with the Golden Rule as men understand it. He is quite content with it as he understands it himself. But he has been asking his friends how they understand it—'several clergymen and laymen'—and they have all given him the same answer. They do not understand it aright.

It is only recently that Professor Sonnenschein came to understand it aright himself. For over half a century he misunderstood it. He is astonished at himself. He is astonished at the whole Christian world. For nearly two thousand years, he says, we have been preoccupied with the subject, and we do not understand it yet.

The Golden Rule is given in the Gospels twice. It is given by St. Matthew (7^{12}) in this form: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.' And it is given by St. Luke (6^{31}) in this form: 'As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.' It seems very easily understood. But the meaning which Professor Sonnenschein took out of it for more than fifty years, and which all his friends take out of it still, is wrong. That meaning is that we are bidden to do to others what we should wish them to do to us, if our positions were reversed; that is to say, if we were in their place and they in ours. And that is not the right meaning.

That could not be the right meaning. For look how it would work out. 'A beggar in the street asks me for money: I ought to give it, because I, if I were in the same situation, should wish another person so to behave towards me, and my hypothetical wish is an index of the wishes of the beggar. An *employé* asks for a rise in his wages: I ought to grant it, because his wish is only what I myself should wish in the same circumstances. An enemy country wishes that we should not make energetic efforts to repel its attacks: we ought to abstain, because if our positions were reversed there is nothing that we should desire more than inactivity on the part of *our* enemies.'

Did Christ teach that? Professor Sonnenschein has no hesitation in answering that He did not. The last example settles it. There are three examples, the beggar, the *employé*, and the enemy. At an earlier period in our national life the example that would have settled it would have been the beggar. At a later period the *employé*. But at the present time the example that settles it is the enemy. It is inconceivable to Professor Sonnenschein that our Lord should have asked the Belgians to lie low and let the Germans pass through their country to the conquest of France.

The misunderstanding, says Professor Sonnenschein, is due to the English translation. And if Professor Sonnenschein had done nothing else by his article in the *Hibbert Journal* for July than draw our attention to the English word that has caused the misunderstanding, he would still have rendered us a considerable service. For we have no idea, any of us, how greatly we are at the mercy of the English of our Bible, or how disas-

trously. The Revisers had a chance to help us. They did not take it. Possibly they did not see the necessity. It is not that the Greek or the Hebrew is mistranslated in the Authorized Version. It is not so often mistranslated as we think. Nor is it that certain words used in that version are now quite obsolete and unintelligible to us. It is that ever so many words have changed their meaning and we do not observe it. We pass over them unsuspectingly, and misunderstand the import of the whole passage or precept. That is what has happened with the Golden Rule.

The word is *would*. 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you.' That 'would,' says Professor SONNENSCHEIN, suggests an 'if' coming after it. It is a conditional. We say in our minds, 'Whatsoever ye would, if ye were in their place.' But it is not a conditional. At the time when the Authorized Version was made it was a simple indicative. It stood for 'whatsoever ye wish.' It was a legitimate and accurately idiomatic translation of the words in the Greek, whether those words are St. Matthew's (ὅσα ἂν θέλητε) or St. Luke's (καθὼς θέλετε).

There is no question of putting ourselves in the place of some one else. It is 'whatsoever we desire' in our own place. And what do we desire? Speaking generally, we desire good. We desire good in our own place, as we are; and the higher we are the truer is the good we desire. We do not desire that which the mendicant desires, which is probably not good for him and is certainly not good for us. We do not desire that which the workman desires, which may or may not be good for him, but is certainly not good for us if we are not workmen. And we do not desire that which the enemy desires, free passage through our country. Such free passage may be good for the enemy demanding it; we do not believe that it is for our good; and we know that it is not for the good of the world.

Was the Apostle Thomas a doubter?

It is not very many years since the question would have been received with ridicule. Of course he was a doubter. What else was he?

Then Tennyson wrote: 'There lives more faith in honest doubt, believe me, than in half the creeds.' Whereupon there came a revolution in men's minds concerning the Apostle Thomas. He might still be a doubter, but he 'doubted well.'

He doubted well. The phrase is Plato's. The present Bishop of London found it there and applied it to Thomas. There are doubters who do not doubt well. There is the indifferent (and probably supercilious) doubter; and there is the superficial self-satisfied doubter. Thomas was not an indifferent doubter. 'I remember,' says the Bishop of London, 'talking to a nice young fellow in Bethnal Green. "Well, now," I said, "what do you think about religion?" "Well, Mr. Ingram," he replied, "to tell you the truth, I never think of it from one end of the year to the other." 'He was a Bethnal Green boy,' continues the Bishop, 'hardly grown up. We cannot blame him; he was never brought up to anything better, but we taught him something better later on.'

That is very likely. For the indifferent doubter is not so difficult to teach as is the superficial talkative doubter. Bacon says: 'A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds round about to religion.' The superficial talking doubter has often a little philosophy, but he rarely proceeds to depth in it. He has no time; so much has he to say about his atheism. He has no inclination; so satisfied is he to have a little philosophy—the greater number have none.

The indifferent doubter and the superficial doubter are both dishonest, the one with himself, the other with us. There is also the honest doubter. And now we are all agreed that if Thomas was a doubter at all, he was an honest doubter. Why was he an honest doubter? Some

say that he doubted with the head while his heart was right. Others say that he doubted with the heart, while his head was right. And some say that he doubted with head and heart both; but he was an honest doubter still.

He doubted with his head. So says ROBERTSON of Brighton. 'There is a class of men,' he says, 'whose reflective powers are stronger than their susceptive: they think out truth—they do not feel it out. Often highly gifted and powerful minds, they cannot rest till they have made all their grounds certain: they do not feel safe as long as there is one possibility of delusion left: they prove all things. Such a man was Thomas. He has well been called the rationalist among the apostles.'

He doubted with his heart. So says Dr. J. D. JONES. 'The doubt of Thomas,' he says, 'sprang not from his head, but from his heart; it was the result not of intellectual difficulty, but of great sorrow. There is no analogy or kinship, therefore, between the doubt of Thomas and the speculative doubt of our own day, caused as that is by intellectual and philosophical difficulties. If you want to find the true analogy to this despair of Thomas, visit some home where "in the shadow of a great affliction a soul sits dumb."'

And he doubted with both head and heart. So says Dr. A. H. DRYSDALE. He says: 'If we read his idiosyncrasy aright, there was in him a special sort of twin-nature: both a masculine and a feminine element; a keen intellect combined with a tender and delicate susceptibility, not often found together, save in exceptionally gifted souls. For Thomas was not a hard and cold being, like many in whom the critical faculty predominates. There are those in whom emotion is stronger than their understanding, who are led by feeling more than by thinking, and simple even to credulity—ready to believe to the verge of superstition; on the other hand, there are some whose reflective powers are much greater than their emotional nature and who are apt to be somewhat apathetic therefore, or aloof in their attachments. To neither of these classes does Thomas belong, or rather he combines both of them in himself in rare and unusual proportions.'

Now, it may not be easy to reconcile all these ideas. But there are contradictions in most of us, and the science of psychology is yet in its infancy. About one thing, however, all the interpreters of Thomas are agreed, and it is the essential thing. With all his doubting, he never wavered in his loyalty. He loved Jesus from the first, and he loved Him to the last. Then let his doubt be of the head or of the heart or of the whole personality, it went down at last before the rush of the river of his affection. It was Thomas who gave John the word he was waiting for, and enabled him to bring his Gospel to an end.

But no sooner had men discovered that Thomas doubted well than some of them began to go a step beyond, and wonder if he doubted at all. Some of the most recent preachers who have preached and published on Thomas believe that a great injustice is done to him in calling him a doubter. It is an injustice from which he has suffered far too long, they say, and they use strong language to do away with it.

Why was he ever called a doubter? Plainly because he doubted the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. He said, 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.'

'But we have to remember,' says Dr. ADENEY, 'that he was the only one who had not seen the risen Christ. For anything we know to the contrary, if he had been present, he would have been convinced; and, for anything we know to the contrary, if any one of the others had been absent, that disciple would have been equally sceptical. As it is, none of them had believed the reports of previous appearances. What the women said

appeared to them all but idle tales, and the appearance to Peter had only filled the rest with perplexity. It was Christ's appearance to them that convinced the eleven; on the next occasion, Thomas being present, he too was convinced.'

The force of this is undeniable. If Thomas had been present on the first appearance of Jesus to the Eleven, he might have been as firmly convinced of the reality of the resurrection as any of them. But that only throws the objection back a step. Why was he not there? Dr. ADENEY answers that we cannot tell. And that is quite true. But we can conjecture.

Now it is a curious circumstance that whenever men began to conjecture why Thomas 'was not with them,' they found that it would not do to say, Because he was a doubter. They were all doubters regarding the resurrection, and there could be no difference of degree of doubt among them, so absolute was it all round. When He did appear, they were all amazed; and again you could not tell which of them was most amazed. If doubt of the resurrection kept Thomas away, nobody would have been present. Why then was Thomas not with them?

The answer introduces us to a new opinion about Thomas. He was not with them because he was a pessimist. So say many expositors and preachers. Some say that he was a pessimist because he was a doubter. Some say that he was a doubter because he was a pessimist. And some say that he was only a pessimist and not properly a doubter at all. But they all say that the real reason why he was not with the rest of the apostles on their first meeting with Jesus was that, being of a melancholy temperament, he was utterly cast down by what had happened, and had gone away to brood over his sorrow alone.

Some preachers draw impressive pictures of Thomas in his solitude. But they draw them of their own imagination. There is no evidence. The reason why they call in their imagination so confidently is that they have already discovered the pessimist in another event. It is the event of the raising of Lazarus from the dead. Jesus had retired from Jerusalem when the message came that Lazarus was sick. And when He intimated to the disciples His intention of returning to its neighbourhood, they were not a little alarmed. 'Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee, and goest thou thither again?' And when He persisted, it was Thomas who said to his fellow-disciples, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him.'

Whereupon Prebendary CALTHROP speaks of his 'despondent character' and 'what we may perhaps call his pessimistic bias'; and Dr. George MATHESON tells us that 'there are two classes of minds which habitually stand in the post of outlook—the man of the laurel and the man of the cypress. The first sees the world as rose-coloured. It is all brightness, all beauty, all glory—a scene of splendid possibilities which is waiting to open for him its gates of gold. The second, on the other hand, approaches it with dismay. To him the prospect looks all dark. He is a pessimist previous to experience. He is sure he will never succeed. He is sure the gate will not open when he tries it. He feels that he has nothing to expect from life. He hangs his harp upon a willow, and goes forth to sow in tears.'

Of these two classes the man of the laurel in the New Testament is John; the man of the cypress is Thomas. 'He came to the facts of life with an antecedent prejudice; he uniformly expected from the banquet an inferior menu. It is a great mistake to imagine that the collapse came with the Crucifixion. Strictly speaking, there was no collapse. If I understand the picture aright, it represents the figure of a man who could never stand at his full stature but was always bent towards the ground. It was not from timidity. He was a courageous man, ready to do and dare anything, even when he was most downcast. It was not

from a mean nature. He was a man of the noblest spirit—capable of the most heroic deeds of sacrifice. That which gave him a crouching attitude was simply a constitutional want of hope—a natural inability to take the bright view.'

But the most recent expositors will have none of it. Dr. ADENEY, whom we have already named, rejects the whole pessimistic hypothesis. He says it is unfair to find pessimism in the words, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him.' 'Is there any evidence,' he asks, 'that the other disciples were a particle more hopeful? Nay, as regards the matter of his saying, was Jesus Himself more hopeful? Jesus had told His friends before this that He would have to die when He went up to Jerusalem. Thomas takes no more gloomy a view of the situation than his Master had taken. Indeed, he simply accepts Christ's own prediction, and bases his proposal upon it. And he was right in his anticipation.'

If Thomas was neither a doubter nor a despairer, what was he? Says Professor GWATKIN: 'He was just what some of our triflers would like to be thought—a sober truthful man who insists on facing the facts he sees before he goes a step further. Such a man is slow to move: no passing enthusiasm can stir him, only the gravest sense of duty. And faith is none the worse for counting the cost before it gives itself to Christ.'

Has Christianity broken down? With the exception of Turkey and Japan, the nations that are engaged in the present war are Christian nations. They are fighting fiercely for the mastery. Some of them are perpetrating atrocities for which it is difficult to find a parallel in all the history of the world. Has Christianity broken down?

The answer, as they say in the House of Commons, is in the negative. No doubt, if the nations that are engaged in the war are Christian nations, Christianity is a failure. But *are* they Christian? When is a nation properly to be called a Christian nation? We may say perhaps when a majority of the members of it are Christians. Is a majority of the people of Germany Christian? Or of Britain? Not in any of the countries engaged in the war can it be claimed that a majority of the inhabitants make even an outward profession of Christianity. It cannot therefore be said that because so many so-called Christian nations are engaged in fierce fighting Christianity has broken down. They are not Christian.

But even if a majority in each country were to be found to profess Christianity, would the nations at war prove the failure of the religion of Christ? Are all those who profess Christianity Christians? What *is* a Christian?

The answer is found in three sentences of the Apostle Paul. The first sentence is: 'Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the commandments of God' (1 Co 7^{19}). The second is: 'For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love' (Gal 5^{6}). And the third is: 'For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature' (Gal 6^{15}). The answer to the question, What is a Christian? is not found in one of these texts alone. It is found when the three texts are taken together.

In each passage St. Paul states, first of all, certain things which do not prove a man to be a Christian. But we shall pass these by for the present. Our question is, What does prove a man to be a Christian? And the answer of the first text is startling enough to arrest attention. St. Paul's answer is, 'The keeping of the commandments of God.'

And it is the answer of Christ Himself. When the young ruler came running and kneeling, 'Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?' Christ's answer was, 'Keep the com-

mandments.' For indeed no other answer can be given. If we keep the commandments of God then are we right with God. He asks no other of us, or can ask. And it is of no moment to inquire, What are the commandments? Any commandments will do, if they are God's. The commandments you are familiar with. 'Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery; honour thy father and thy mother'—those will do. Or, if you prefer it, the summary of the commandments so memorably expressed by one of the prophets, when he said, 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?'

But who has done it? In the Westminster Shorter Catechism there is a question which runs: 'Is any man able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God?' And the answer is, 'No mere man since the fall is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God; but doth daily break them, in thought, word, and deed.'

Perhaps you do not take your theology from the Shorter Catechism. Perhaps you do not think that it is orthodox theology. It may not be orthodox theology; but it is orthodox practice. For what is orthodoxy? Is it not the theology or the practice of the majority? And here not merely is the majority with the Shorter Catechism, everybody is with it. There is no minority. Once there was for a moment a minority of one. The young ruler said, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' But in another moment he was undeceived. Jesus took the eighth commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal,' and showed him that he had not kept it, and could not keep it, unless he sold all that he had and gave to the poor.

There is no way of keeping the commandments of God except by misunderstanding them. It is probable, although we know of only one actual case, that in the time of our Lord there were not a few who thought they had kept them all from their youth up. It was for this reason that He delivered the Sermon on the Mount. For what is the Sermon on the Mount from first to last but an explanation of what is meant by keeping the commandments? 'He that looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.'

In our day the attitude is different. No one with the Sermon on the Mount in his hands is hardy enough to say, 'All these have I kept from my youth up.' The attitude now is that we cannot be expected to keep them, that something less than keeping must be sufficient, and that if we do justly and love mercy and walk humbly with our God *in a measure* all is bound to be well with us.

But how can God accept a partial obedience? How can He have fellowship with the half saint who is half a sinner? How can He wink at the breaking of the everlasting laws of righteousness, upon which the very universe is hung, and of which all the commandments are but intelligible expressions? Eternal life is nothing if it is not walking with God; and as somebody asks very pointedly, 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' We had better accept it at once, however it go against the natural man in us, that to be right with God we must keep the commandments in the sense of the Sermon on the Mount, that is to say, by being 'perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect.' Whereupon we are bound to admit that we cannot do it.

What then? Then begins the Gospel. For let it now be confessed that there is no Gospel, no Christ, and no Christianity in anything that we have yet said. It is all out of the Old Testament. It is all law. Even the summary of the commandments, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself,' incomparable as it is, and accepted by our Lord, is taken from the Old Testament. Christianity begins when we turn from the first sentence quoted

from St. Paul to the second. What is it that proves a man to be a Christian? It is 'faith working through love.'

Now in that answer we are arrested at once by the introduction of a person. For you cannot have faith in a thing. Who is that person? It is the Lord Jesus Christ. To be a Christian is to have faith in Christ. And if there are more kinds of faith than one, it is to have that kind of faith which works through love. For the keeping of the commandments still holds. It is not Christianity, but it is accepted by Christ. As He said, He came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it. Christianity is faith in Christ to the keeping of the commandments, the way of keeping them being through love.

Let us take the sum of the commandments as Christ accepted it: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.' How does faith in Christ make us able to do that? By the offer of Christ Himself. Is He worth loving? Faith tells us that. It tells us what He has done for us. It offers Him to us as He is. We put ourselves among the 'lost' whom He came to seek and to save; we turn for salvation to Him; and at that very moment He meets us with His 'Son, daughter, be of good cheer, thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.' Whereupon we see Him as He is, altogether worthy of our love and waiting for it. We love Him, because He first loved us.

Now in loving Christ we love both God and man. As He said, 'He that loveth me, loveth my Father also.' And as we may say, turning other words of His round a little, 'Inasmuch as ye do it unto me, ye do it unto the least of these my brethren.' And what is this but to keep the commandments? For the sum of the commandments (let us say it again) is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.'

This, then, is the Christian, and there is no other. He keeps the commandments. Not in the Old Testament sense of striving to love God with all his heart and his neighbour as himself, and ever failing ignominiously. Still less in the pharisaic sense of taking the commandments one by one and saying, 'All these have I kept,' though there is no emotion of love to God or man in the heart. Such was the elder son of the parable, rude with his father and contemptuous towards his brother. The Christian keeps the commandments because he loves Christ who is both God and man. And he loves Christ because he has rested upon Him alone for salvation.

And such a Christian is a new creature. That is St. Paul's third statement. We call him so, using this very English word. But the English word does not express exactly what the Apostle said. He said 'a new creation.' For that faith which worketh by love is more than a transfiguration. In all outward reflexion, however great the glory reflected, there is the element of instability. The glory of the Christian is not a glory that passes away, as was the glory that blazed in the face of Moses when he came down from the mount. It is more than a transfiguration. It is a creation. As at the beginning God saw all things which He had created, and said, 'Very good'; so now He sees us in our shield and looks upon us in the face of His anointed, and although we still fail of the keeping of many of the commandments taken by themselves, He sees no iniquity in us. We are a new creation, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, and once more He is able to regard His own handiwork, and to say, 'Very good.'

Jesus' Teaching and Modern Thought.

By Rev. Cavendish Moxon, M.A., Rector of Marske, Yorkshire.

What is the effect of modern thought upon our estimate and use of the teaching of Jesus? That is the question which we must attempt to answer. Our knowledge of the methods, debates, and results of modern thought, forces us once more to ask, 'What think ye of Christ' and of His words? In any case, both the friends and the foes of Christianity are urging us to look this difficult problem in the face. On the one hand, there are teachers who say that the teaching of Jesus may be ideal, but is wildly unpractical and quite useless for this present world, which is unready for the Christian anarchy that Tolstoy sees in the gospel of Jesus.[1]

Other writers, like Sir Francis Younghusband in a recent issue of the *Hibbert Journal*, declare that the ethics of Jesus are imperfect and already superseded by the judgments of modern ethical teachers. On the other hand, there are some writers who doubt much of the doctrine about Christ and yet ask us to make Jesus our sole Master and His words our final authority. The liberal theologian, Professor E. Ménégoz, for instance, asks us to separate carefully the words of Jesus from the words of His disciples, and then to make the former our basis for faith and practice. Whatever in Christian doctrine does not conform to this pattern of sound words as uttered by Jesus must be rejected as contrary to His Spirit and will.

In view of this conflict of opinion we are inevitably led to inquire what exactly is the authority and worth of Jesus' teaching for us who accept the new knowledge as a divine gift. But before we can answer this question we must state briefly how our view of Jesus Himself and of His recorded words has been modified by modern thought.

Before the rise of modern criticism the whole of Jesus' teaching possessed, in theory at least, an almost unquestioned authority on the minds and consciences of His followers. Vast superstructures of dogma, organization, ceremony, and precept were reared by the Church on the foundation of a few texts. But modern thought has made the ancient methods of building doctrines for ever impossible. It has caused a serious unsettlement of the very textual foundations upon which some of the ancient and modern dogmas have been built by the Church. We can no longer use all the reported words of Jesus as sure bases for the erection of eternal truths of fact and of obligation. It is now well known that the comparative study of the Gospels has revealed serious discrepancies of both matter and form in the different records of the same sayings of Jesus. It is generally agreed that Mark is the earliest of our Gospels, and that both Matthew and Luke used Mark in a form which was nearly, if not quite, the same as our copy of Mark. This result is important for our present inquiry, because it enables us to see for ourselves the free way in which Matthew and Luke ventured to edit the sayings of Jesus which they borrowed from Mark. These evangelists did not scruple to omit some phrases that offended their taste and to alter other sayings for various practical and religious reasons. It is surprising to observe, for instance, how Matthew deals with Mark's version of our Lord's question to the rich young man who came to consult Him. By changing 'Why callest thou me good?' into 'Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?' Matthew robs the sentence of its original sense and even fails to make the new phrase fit in its old surroundings. We need not doubt that it was the evangelists' desire to be reverent and edifying that led them to handle so freely their Master's teaching. We may even concede that some of the N.T. writers were inspired to express the spirit of Jesus' teaching in forms that are more congenial to our thought than the Galilean mode of speech could be. Still, the fact remains that their discrepant accounts of Jesus' words make it very difficult to ascertain exactly what He said. Since Matthew and Luke are known to have dealt very freely with their Markan material, it is probable that Mark in his turn dealt just as freely with the oral or written traditions he had received. It is evident that Mark was interested in the miracle stories rather than in the teaching connected with the gospel; and on the earliest possible date for Mark there was time for inaccuracies to arise in the trans-

[1] The school of General von Bernhardi in Germany.

mission of Jesus' sayings from mouth to mouth. And if we feel uncertain about the accuracy of Mark and its sources, we feel still more uncertain about the accuracy of the records of Jesus' words in our latest Gospel according to St. John, whoever its author may have been. Both the form and the matter of Jesus' teaching are here so different from the earliest traditions that we are not justified in using any saying in John as evidence of what Jesus said or taught unless it is supported by sayings in the earlier Gospels.

The conclusion to which modern study of the Gospels points may be stated thus. We can in no instance feel certain that we have an absolutely exact record of what Jesus said, and therefore we must not attempt to make the words of Jesus the sole basis for modern Christianity. It is highly probable, however, that many of His sayings and parables are so far correctly reported as to enable us to see His meaning and to gain a clear idea of the main points and principles of His teaching.

Now if, as I believe, modern scholars have succeeded in sifting out many authentic sayings of Jesus from those which the Church has put into His mouth; if we know, at least in part, what Jesus taught about God, man, Himself, religion, the present and the future life, then we are prepared to ask the further question: How, in the light of modern knowledge, does this teaching affect our estimate of Jesus Himself?

In order to paint the old orthodox picture of Christ, the Church used all the materials in the four Gospels. The question now is this, What sort of picture of Jesus can we make when we can no longer use the high colours of the Fourth Gospel, but must use only the well-sifted traditions of the Synoptists for our portrait? The chief difference between the old picture of Jesus and the new is our frank recognition of the limitations in Jesus as He is conceived by the methods of modern thought. We no longer suppose that when Jesus made inquiries or showed surprise about matters of fact He only feigned ignorance for the sake of His hearers. The recent study of the apocalyptic and eschatological teaching of Jesus has made it probable that our Lord's knowledge was more limited than used to be supposed by writers like Bishop Gore.

It is impossible now to review in full the evidence that has convinced many of us that Jesus shared some of the illusions prevalent in His day with regard to the end of this world. On one point, at any rate, there will be a general agreement. Jesus' faith in the near approach of the Kingdom of God was quite central in His gospel, and therefore His vivid vision of the end affected directly or indirectly the whole of His ethical and religious teaching. It is therefore impossible to judge fairly both what Jesus said and what it is not recorded that He said unless we read His words in the closest connexion with His expectation of the speedy end of the present age.

There are hard sayings of Jesus, especially in the collection we call the Sermon on the Mount, which it is necessary to explain unnaturally or to ignore altogether if we suppose them to have been uttered with a long course of this world's history in view. But these sayings at once become intelligible and appropriate when we understand them to be the practical applications of that great principle of Jesus' gospel, 'the kingdom of God is at hand.' Some examples will serve to make my meaning clear.

The Gospels contain repeated demands of Jesus that relatives, lands, and riches should be renounced in order that nothing might hinder the urgent task of preparation for the coming Kingdom. All lower goods were to be sacrificed if their pursuit interfered with absolute trust in the triumphant power and love that were so soon to appear unchecked. It was thus quite natural that Jesus refused to arbitrate upon matters of social justice, that He forbade His followers to resist evil in defence of their rights, and that He had no constructive social policy. Riches were condemned by Jesus as a hindrance to the frame of mind He wished to produce in His followers; but there is not a word about a transference of money or land to any community for the good of each of its members. Since the Kingdom was expected in that generation, Jesus put forward no socialistic or any other economic scheme. All attempts, therefore, to find support in His sayings for the details of such schemes are bound to fail.

Again, it is unfair to blame Jesus because He did not teach the right use of our emotions and passions and the culture of the æsthetic and intellectual sides of human nature. Jesus never approved of violent ascetical practices for their own sake, as Sir Francis Younghusband seems to suppose; but on Jesus' view of the world there was no time for a gradual and cultured conquest of the

lower self. It was indeed a time of crisis in which Jesus called men even to lose their bodily life if only by that way they could attain the eternal life.

Sir Francis Younghusband sees a further mark of imperfection in the ethics of Jesus in the fact that He condemned forethought and provision for the future needs of the body. This criticism, however, is relevant and fair only if Jesus' precepts are judged as universally applicable rules. Since Jesus did not foresee the indefinite continuance of our present conditions of life, His precepts on such matters can be rightly judged only in their historical context.

Now if the teaching of Jesus was thus conditioned, what must we conclude its present authority and application to be? Must we say that it was merely an ethic for the interval before the end came, and therefore without any value for our modern world?[1] To this question, 'Has the teaching of Jesus a temporary or a permanent value?' it seems impossible to give a simple answer 'yes' or 'no.' It is essential to make a distinction here. All ethical teaching has a side that is conditioned by the particular time and place. Many moral maxims, for instance, depend on our having a material body. But it is also true that ethics contains under earthly forms eternal principles that are valid for all spiritual beings. In the teaching of Jesus, then, there is a local and ephemeral part and also a universal and eternal part. Jesus doubtless regarded some of His teachings as interim ethics: He looked forward to no buying and selling, riches and poverty, marriage and divorce in the Kingdom of God. But there is every reason to suppose that He regarded the great principles of love to God and man as the very foundation on which is based the everlasting reign of God in the hearts of His true sons. And we must make the same distinction when we judge our Lord's words. On the one hand, we may admit the limitations due to the forms of thought and manner of speech in His day. On the other hand, we may assert that He revealed spiritual and moral values that can never lose their worth because they are an aspect of the very life of God. Jesus promulgated no perfect code of moral laws, valid for all time. He had no perfect knowledge upon all possible pursuits of the human mind. But I have no doubt that we are right in sharing His conviction that a life of trustful devotion to the Highest is a final revelation of God's will for our race. It is therefore only in a general and spiritual sense that we can uphold the authority of Jesus and defend the perfection of His teaching, and the truth of His revelation of Reality.

[1] Jesus Himself, it appears, did not regard His teaching as a *mere* 'Interims-ethik.'

The fact seems to be that we are only just learning what it means to confess that Jesus was not only man, but a Galilean man of nearly 2000 years ago, and that He only revealed a religious knowledge of the will of God. This admission involves no loss since it relieves us of the difficulties that had been felt in the attempt to harmonize the scientific and historical opinions of Jesus with our modern knowledge. In order to illustrate the subjects upon which the beliefs implied in Jesus' teaching cannot foreclose our free inquiry we may notice the following:—

(1) Jesus' scientific opinions. Our Lord probably shared the ancient belief that what we know as diseases of the brain were caused by the possession of evil spirits.

(2) Historical opinions. With regard to the authorship and literal accuracy of the O.T. books, Jesus probably shared the current convictions that modern criticism has in some cases shown to be mistaken.

(3) Beliefs about the next world. Since, as we have seen, Jesus shared some of the less crude eschatological beliefs of His times, it is impossible to find in His teaching any information as to the exact nature of life after death. His words provide no basis for certainty with regard to the fact or the extent of future probation or purgation or of the ultimate salvation of all created souls. His parables, indeed, rather point to a final exclusion of the wicked from the heavenly Kingdom.

(4) Beliefs about the use of force by nations and individuals as a means to moral ends. The sayings of Jesus with reference to non-resistance are concerned with attacks upon property. And it was precisely in regard to property that the maxims of Jesus were most influenced by His belief in the imminent end of this age. In view of this coming catastrophe Christians might well be enjoined to set aside all earthly goods, give all their money to the poor, and even consent to the wicked seizure of their possessions as a safeguard against the sins of covetousness, hatred and revenge. We maintain, against the school of

General von Bernhardi, that the principles to which these sins are opposed are binding still upon men and nations at all times, though the particular form of Christ's application of these principles was dependent on a view of the world that is now transcended. There are some Christians who believe in peace at any price, and there are others, like Rev. G. T. Sadler, who allow 'passive resistance' while they condemn 'active resistance.' But neither class can rightly claim the authority of the Sermon on the Mount, if our view of it is correct. We conclude, then, that pacificists have no reason from the Gospels to condemn all war, but the highest reasons for waging war, not for motives of hatred or revenge, but for the promotion of freedom, honour, justice, and truth among men.

(5) Metaphysical beliefs. Jesus revealed no new dogma about the ultimate Reality. He did not formulate the doctrine of the Trinity which was afterwards elaborated in order to express the meaning and value of the revelation in and through the person of Christ. Jesus' faith in the Fatherhood of God is still, to speak in the cold phrase of metaphysics, only a probable hypothesis. To many of us, indeed, it is the most probable theory of the nature of Reality. If, as is probable, Jesus shared the Jews' belief in the devil, His belief is not binding upon us as the most exact possible explanation of the origin of evil. To the present writer a personal devil is an unnecessary and improbable hypothesis, in view of man's evolution from the lower and instinctively savage life of the brutes.

Is it not clear, then, that these critical investigations of modern thought involve no loss at all in the resulting conception of Jesus Christ? They are indeed a pure and positive gain, since they avert our gaze from what is doubtful so that we may fix our attention wholly upon those teachings of Christ that cannot be shaken. Jesus did not come to tell us all the secrets of natural science, of history, or even of metaphysics. His authority lies deeper than that of the scholar, and therefore we may be content not to know exactly what He said upon these subjects. Jesus came to reveal a life and a character that are eternal and divine. He came, therefore, not to fetter us with His theories of the world, but to give us a Holy Spirit, a hope and an end in our life. He only asked us to give the utmost for the Highest; to devote ourselves wholly to the pursuit of Truth, Goodness, Beauty, and Joy, which are our modern names for what Jesus called 'the Kingdom of God.'

In the Study.

The Gate.

The Rev. Richard Roberts has published through the Student Christian Movement four addresses, three of which were delivered to students at the University of Liverpool. The title is *Christ and Ourselves*. The third lecture is on the Acceptance of Christ. In that lecture Mr. Roberts takes his text from the parable which we are accustomed to call the Parable of the Door (Jn 10^9). He properly calls it the Parable of the Gate. For it is an open way in and out that is spoken of. He finds three ideas expressed in the parable.

1. *Security.*—'If any man enter in by me, he shall be saved.' Security is something we are all seeking. We are for ever putting or trying to put ourselves beyond the reach of the long arm of danger and mischance. But we know that with all our endeavour we stand in jeopardy every hour. Our life is a fragile and precarious affair at the best, and none of the barricades with which we fence our lives about are impenetrable. Mere physical security we shall never attain. But there is a security which we may, and it is infinitely more precious; we may gain *moral* security. The counterpart of the figure of the Gate of the fold is the Shepherd of the sheep. And the Shepherd of the sheep says that they hear His voice and follow Him: 'And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no man shall be able to pluck them out of my hand.' And this is the guarantee He gives of our security—'The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.' Will you suffer a witness of my own? I am a man of the commonest clay, of more than ordinary frailty, of more than ordinary amenability to temptation . . . and up to this day I am conscious of being a man who has been kept, and often (the more is the shame) kept in spite of himself. The

Lord is my Keeper. There is no doubt of that. Every one who has tried Him has found Him so. He shall be saved,—so runs the promise,—saved from dishonour, disgrace, shame, remorse, moral collapse, saved from very perdition. And it is true to-day as when Paul declared that neither life nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor any other creature, shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. 'He shall be saved,' that is, if he enter in. Accept Jesus Christ and you find a Saviour. To accept Him as Lord is to surrender to Him all that you are and have; to find Him a Saviour is to know that He will give you all that you require.

2. *Spaciousness.*—'He shall go in and out.' Another thing we want is freedom, spaciousness. We all want plenty of room. Perhaps our commonest complaint about life is that it is narrow, circumscribed, cramped. And in these days of specialization when most of us are set to do little bits of work and to do them over and over again, the narrowness of the routine cramps and paralyzes us utterly. I do not wonder when I hear that Smith or Brown has got tired of the city or the shop and has gone forth to seek space and emancipation in the broad plains of another continent. There is a restlessness in us which demands range, space, but of all futile things, to imagine that we can get more space by a change of environment is the most futile. The man who is cramped in the city will soon or late feel cramped on the prairie. The only spaciousness of life that is genuine and abiding is that which comes within us, when our minds become a continent and our souls a universe. And that comes with our surrender to Jesus Christ. He is not only Saviour, but emancipator and liberator. He will transfigure the dull narrow routine into a splendid highway; He will give us the franchise of a kingdom of boundless wealth; He will break the bands and fetters of routine and make the most stuffy vocation a palace of great possibilities. He himself becomes our universe in which henceforth we live and move and have our being.

3. *Sufficiency.*—'He shall find pasture.' Superfluity is not in the promise, but sufficiency is. Let him go in by the gate of fame, ambition, wealth, and he gains not sufficiency but scarcity, not food but a famine, not satisfaction but a growing hunger. Listen to this: 'I know from experience the intellectual distractions of scientific research, philosophical speculation and artistic pleasures; but am also well aware that even when all are taken together and well sweetened to taste, in respect of consequent reputation, means, social position, etc., the whole concoction is but as high confectionery to a starving man.' This is the testimony of a man who was forced back at last upon the Gate which is Christ; and there he found sufficiency, enough to live upon. This is the unbroken witness of all who have entered in by this Gate; and it was a man who had gone in by this Gate who declared that he had learned whatever state he was in, therein to be content,—wanting nothing. The experience of St. Paul is confirmed by all the saints; and no man yet has found Jesus Christ come short of His word.

Security, spaciousness, sufficiency—here are our deepest needs. Jesus Christ stands or falls according to His ability to supply these needs as He promises. But this must be put to the test of personal experiment. One must try Him and give Him His opportunity, and that indeed is all that He asks. And one finds that the 'dead reckoning' of to-day becomes the midday sun of every subsequent morrow.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

September Gleaners.

'Let me glean and gather after the reapers among the sheaves.'—Ruth 2^7.

There was a wonderful French painter called Millet. When he was a boy he was quite poor, his father being just what we in this country call a crofter. When little Jean Millet sat down to dinner, it would be at a very bare, homely table. But though no one seemed to notice it, Jean had eyes that saw everything, and he had a heart that loved those round about him. He had seen old women gleaning in the harvest fields, and he noticed that they looked tired and weary—so different from those who were young. Furthermore he could not but observe that many field workers were very good. When the Angelus, or call for evening prayer, rang out across the fields, Jean had seen the men take off their caps, and close their eyes as if they prayed, while the women bowed their heads and looked solemn. In course of time, Jean

became an artist, and painted a picture called 'The Angelus.' It is very beautiful. You must remember to look for a print of it: there are many of them all over the country. He also painted one called 'The Gleaners.' The latter is a picture with a great deal of thought in it. Many English and Scottish people who visit country districts in France, and see the men and women working in the harvest fields, think of those two pictures of Millet's, 'The Angelus' and 'The Gleaners.' Through them, they have learnt to love the French peasantry.

But there are pictures that are not painted on canvas. Haven't you yourselves got pictures in your own minds? You have, I feel sure, one of 'Joseph' in his coat of many colours, of 'Rebecca at the Well,' of 'Moses,' when he had reached the safe shore of the Red Sea. In the Book of Ruth there is a beautiful picture of a gleaner. It is finer than Millet's one. Millet's work will become old-fashioned; people will one day speak of him as belonging to a past age. But the Bible picture of 'Ruth the Gleaner' is loved more and more as time goes on. Millet's gleaners make us think of life being toilsome, of women having to work when they are old and tired; the gleaners of the Book of Ruth live in the sunshine, they are all young.

Gleaners had a real place in the Jewish harvest field. In our country, they would be spoken to sharply, and sent home. But there was an old Hebrew law about gleaning. Listen to it, for it is very beautiful.

'When ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I am the Lord. . . . When thou cuttest down thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands.'

Ruth, although I can believe she was very gentle, and very beautiful, took her place amongst those poor people. In the course of her short life sad things had happened to her, but she was very brave. She and her mother-in-law had had a long talk together about their sorrows, and the elderly woman discovered that Ruth cared more for love than for the mere enjoyment of life. 'Let me now go to the field, and glean ears of corn after him in whose sight I shall find grace,' she pleaded with Naomi. And Boaz, the owner of the field to which she went, was very good indeed to her. It is a very fascinating story. The poet Keats represents Ruth as weeping when she hears the nightingale singing while she gleans. If she did weep, her tears, I feel sure, would be tears of thankfulness and joy. Grown-up people do sometimes shed tears when they are very glad and thankful.

Here are a few lines of Keats' exquisite poem on the Nightingale:

Thou wast not born for death, immortal Bird!

. . . . . .

The voice I hear this passing night was heard
in ancient days by emperor and clown;
Perhaps the self-same song that found a path
through the sad heart of Ruth, when, sick for home,
She stood in tears amid the alien corn.

'Ruth, the Gleaner' is an old-time picture. But during these September days, I hope many of you may have an opportunity of being in some harvest field. There is no fun like the fun of playing amongst the stooks. Long ago, how we used to love to hear the swish of the scythe, and watch the women gathering the corn, and binding the sheaves. You will not, I fear, see a real gleaner like Ruth. The gleaner in the field you visit will probably be just a boy with a big rake.

I want to turn your attention to that boy. He is sometimes very interesting. Underneath his silence there may be much that is worth copying. If a big person asked an Aberdeenshire 'rake' how he liked his work, the answer would probably be as curt as 'I like it fine.' But the memory of not a few Aberdeenshire farm boys has come to be a sacred memory. I knew one who became a great scholar. While he raked, silently—for he rarely spoke—his mind was on his 'version,' and when he dreamed dreams—which he sometimes did—they were of one day going to the university.

'That is all very fine and fanciful,' some one here may be saying, 'but I live in a city tenement, I never see the harvest fields.' Let me tell you of a boy gleaner, whose home was in a top-flat. His name was Jim. He attended Sunday School, and one day the teacher put a question, the answer to which involved the mention of an obscure classical character. To her surprise Jim answered correctly.

'How did you come to know that?' she asked. 'Please,' he said, 'they were taking in coals to the Academy; I followed the carts, and gathered up all the loose leaves in the yards and read them at home.' Jim was a gleaner, and a good one.

And there was a little Italian fellow, called Michael. His father was a stone-cutter. Michael was strong in mind and body. The first sounds he knew were the ring of the hammer, and the working of the chisel in the quarries. He was not a clever scholar. He just kept scribbling over everything with drawings. His father was disappointed and whipped the boy for spoiling the white-washed walls of the house. But whippings did no good. Michael went back to his drawings: he thought it was worth while suffering pain, so long as he could get on. But he had made a great friend—a boy about his own age, who was learning to be an artist, whose father had plenty of money. His name was Francesco. Every morning Francesco brought to Michael designs borrowed from his master's studio, and these Michael copied. He made wonderful progress, and in course of time became the great Michael Angelo. But I feel sure that he looked back to those days when he 'gleaned' as being very happy days indeed. What did whippings matter?

In Lanarkshire there was born into a humble home a boy who was named David. His father's name was Neil Livingstone. When David was quite little he used to help his mother in the house. He did not quite like this work, and made it a condition that the house door should be kept shut so that the people passing might not see him working. At ten years of age he was sent to work in a factory. With his first half-crown, he bought an old Latin Grammar. He propped it up on the back of his spinning frame, and as he went backwards and forwards, he learnt little bits by heart. That was 'gleaning.' I daresay you have guessed that he became the great missionary, David Livingstone.

Now, boys and girls, this world is a wonderful harvest field. The little flowers! Can't we glean their sweetness? Can't we learn their names? There are men and women, as well as boys and girls, who glean constantly, and in ever so many different fields. They get to know a great deal, yet they themselves feel that they are but beginning to learn. Gleaning is work that makes one feel very happy. I can imagine how Ruth and Naomi would, at the end of the first day's work, thank God for His goodness. When you go back to school, you go to glean in a harvest field. Great reapers have been in front of you, and have left many sheaves. You surely will not throw away your splendid opportunities. And, lying before you are the sheaves left by those who wanted most of all to know about God and His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. I knew a very clever student. He loved the Bible above everything. Morning, noon, and night he studied it. He gleaned with all his might. In his enthusiasm he worked so hard that to the sorrow of all his friends he fainted by the way; but now that he is gone from this world, men are gleaning the sheaves that he left behind. Thus the gleaning goes on. Boys and girls, will you, along with your school work, try every day to glean a little knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ? If you do, you will grow to be the sort of men and women that make the world better.

II.

Children of the North Wind.

'A stormy wind came out of the north.'—Ezek 1[4].

I have been thinking lately that different people are rather like different winds. Some are North-wind people, some South-wind, some East-wind, and some West-wind. So I am going to speak to you about each of these winds in turn, and the people who are like them, and I hope you will be able to recognize yourself amongst them. Of course there are winds between these that have a bit of both North and East, and these we call North-East winds; and winds which have a bit of both South and East, and these we call South-East winds; and so on. And there are people too who have a bit of two winds in their nature, so if you cannot find yourself amongst the North-wind people, or the South-wind people, or the East-wind people, or the West-wind people, perhaps you will find yourself if you take a bit out of two of those winds and put them together.

Well we shall have a talk to-day about the North-wind people. I think you will find most of them among the boys, though you may find a few among the girls too.

Mr. North Wind is rather a blustering old fellow. He bursts open our doors, and howls down our chimneys. He brings blizzards which chill us to the bone and hard frosts which burst our water-

pipes and crack our jugs if we are not careful. When he blows in real earnest he allows nothing to stand in his way. He snaps the bare branches off the trees, he tears the slates off our roofs, and dashes the hail against our windows. In fact, he makes a great amount of noise, and does a good deal of destruction.

So much for Mr. North Wind himself; but now what about the North-wind people? Well, they are the sort of people you hear all over the house. You always know when they are in, because they immediately signal their entrance by slamming the front door. Then they dash upstairs three steps at a time, and slam another door at the top. Their boots seemed to have more nails in them than any other people's; at any rate, they have the gift of clattering to a marvellous extent.

These people are destructive. They seem to have little regard for mother's good carpets or any of her treasured possessions. It is not that they really want to destroy them, but they just don't think. Their manners are a little rough, and they have rather a bad habit of speaking before they think, so that sometimes they damage other people's feelings as they damage the carpets—just for want of thought. Their tempers are somewhat breezy, but usually it is the case with them of a good storm and then all is over. The worst of it is that they sometimes do a good deal of destruction with these storms, and the effects are felt by others after they are forgotten by themselves.

But we are not going to say that Mr. North Wind has nothing but defects. Oh dear, no! He is really a decent sort of chap, and, to tell the truth, we are rather fond of him. First of all, he is very bracing to strong people. He blows away a lot of microbes, and makes our blood tingle with health. And then, if he does frighten the plants so that they hide underground, he at least gives compensation, for he brings a thick blanket of snow to cover them up and keep them cosy, so that they shoot up again stronger than ever in the Spring.

And then he is an out-and-out fellow. There is no deceit about him. He doesn't pretend to be anything else but what he is. As he comes rushing along he shouts, 'Here I am now! Look out for squalls! Build up your fires, and put on your overcoats, and your thickest boots, for when I begin to blow in good earnest, you know what that means!'

And he is a jolly fellow. He provides us with a lot of fun in the way of skating, and sledging, and snowballing; in fact, we should miss him dreadfully if he deserted us altogether.

And we really could not get on without our North-wind people. They do a lot to cheer us up. They are a little rough in their way of doing it, but they are so jolly and good-hearted that we are ready to make allowances for that. They are very straight and above-board, and are so anxious not to appear better than they are, that they usually succeed in making people think they are a great deal worse than they are. You would be surprised to find how tender they sometimes are to little weak things, just as Mr. North Wind is tender to the little weak plants, and covers them up with snow. It is only by chance you discover this, because they are awfully ashamed to let other people know they have a soft spot in their hearts.

I want to say just one word in closing to the North-wind people. Don't be proud of your roughness. It is nothing to be proud of. In fact, if you persist in it, it will spoil and disfigure you in the end. The North Wind cannot help its roughness and harshness, because it is made that way, and it comes to us over fields of ice and snow in the Polar regions. But you can help your roughness. It is something you wear on the outside; it is a habit which can be got rid of. But remember you will have to fight it, and you will have to *want* to fight it. Boys and girls of the North Wind, let your good hearts tell. Don't keep them hidden away inside that hard exterior. Give yourselves over to the keeping of Jesus, and He will help you to get rid of all your defects: He will make the hard places in your nature soft, and the rough places smooth.

III.

The Rev. Thomas McConnell, B.A., has published some addresses which he gave to his young people on 'Belgium, the Great War, and our Lads in Blue.' After the title of the first address he calls his book *White Wings* (Allenson; 1s. net). One of the addresses is on

Fog.

You will recollect that in our first address, one night when the sea was calm and everything peaceful and still, the captain of the little steamer, whose duty it was to sail between Harwich and

Antwerp, pointed out that it was not always like that. There were times when it was rough enough.

That led me to reflect on the dangers of the deep.

'What are you most afraid of at sea, captain?'

'Oh, I fancy a good thick fog is just as dangerous a customer to deal with as anything that comes our way.'

And so I shall speak of fog, the sailor's foe; an enemy that daring is no protection against, but which demands the greatest caution. A man may have no fear as he dashes into the thick wall of mist by which he is enveloped, yet I will not call that courage. Rather is it foolhardiness, that so recklessly risks collision. For the only way to fight fog is by caution, and again caution every time.

How great has been the toll of ships around our British coasts, practically every year, on account of fog! When we get our cross-channel mails regularly every morning, little do we think of the brave men whose business it is nightly to risk their lives, in order to bring them to us.

It is when some great disaster like the loss of the *Empress of Ireland* takes place, owing to collision in fog, that it is brought home to us how great are the risks that brave men are continually taking, and that without a word, upon the sea. Oh, I think that in these islands of ours, where we do not boast when we say that our home is upon the deep, we should never forget in church or at the family altar to pray for our heroes who go down to the sea in ships!

And specially at this time, when our fathers and brothers and husbands and sons their nightly vigil keep, watching with patience lest the enemy steal upon their dear ones in the silence of the night; in these days of peril and need, when we have the flag of Nelson and his gallant sea-dogs still to keep flying, should we unceasingly call upon the name of the Lord for help and keeping.

None know better than our boys in blue how hard a task it is to watch an enemy's fleet, on the alert to dash through under cover of a heavy fog, and inflict damage on a defenceless town. But they know that in England are wives and mothers and sleeping children who are trusting them, and they are determined to do their duty. God bless them!

Eternal Father, strong to save,
Whose arm hath bound the restless wave,
Who bidd'st the mighty ocean deep
Its own appointed limits keep,
O hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea.

O Trinity of love and power,
Our brethren shield in danger's hour;
From rock and tempest, fire and foe,
Protect them wheresoe'er they go:
Thus evermore shall rise to Thee
Glad hymns of praise from land and sea.

How helpless even a skilful mariner feels in a fog! I remember being practically held up in a heavy fog on the Bank of Newfoundland, a place where fogs are almost continuous, for three days and nights. We could not see the bow of the ship, although we were in a position almost amidships. Like a thick, clammy blanket the fog clung around us, creating a dismal, miserable feeling among us all. At about four knots an hour we crawled along, and sometimes in the night we knew the ship had stopped, and once even she reversed engines.

What gave us greatest confidence was the knowledge that we had an exceptionally skilful and experienced commander in charge, the commodore, in fact, of the fleet of steamers by one of which we were travelling. It was good to know that while we were helpless ourselves, yet we had for captain one whom we could trust, one who knew his business thoroughly, and who would take no undue risks. We were late in getting in, but we arrived.

Young people, friends of mine, before you reach the home port you will doubtless encounter fog—it may be seen. There is the fog of doubt. How many temptations there are at school and college, in the office and in business, among the young bloods of our modern life, to doubt almost everything one has learned about the Bible, about the Christian religion, about God!

More dangerous is it still when young people begin to question whether, after all, it pays to be good, to keep the Sabbath day, to pray, to take one's stand on the side of honesty, of truth, and of purity.

'Indulge this once just to see what it is like.' It is the Devil's voice I hear, whispering in your ear. And when one begins to wonder whether it

is not the best course to thrust one's hand into the fire to see whether it will burn, the fog is getting very thick indeed, and a soul is already in deadliest peril.

The only right course for a ship venturing out upon the sea of life, where fogs are rife, is to get the right Captain on the bridge from the start. Have Him there before the fog begins, before doubt has suggested itself to your mind, before the glamour of sin has blinded you to the beauty of holiness. Get Jesus upon the bridge, and He will keep you safe and sound amid all the perils that shall follow.

Around the fire on a winter evening a fellow-student of my own told me that for a considerable time he had been an agnostic. I knew him for a keen, enthusiastic Christian worker, and I asked him—

'What was it led you to faith?'

'Well,' he said, 'there was one thing I could never get away from, and that was my mother's piety. I could easily have riddled all her arguments, but I could not riddle her sweet Christian character, and I knew it was her religion which was the mainspring of that.'

'Did you become clear about things all at once?'

'Oh no, it all came gradually. When I was a boy of twelve I had given my heart to the Saviour, and in those days He was very real to me. It seems to me that He then mounted the bridge of my life, and that He never took His hand off the helm.'

'Was He with you in your doubting days?'

'I am sure of it. They were only a phase such as every young man whose mind is waking up passes through. But Jesus held His place in my life, silently and surely, though I did not know it. And then when I contrasted my mother's pure, angelic life and character with the nothings I had been exalting in its place, I saw that only Christ, who was responsible for that character, could satisfy my mind, as I had come to think He alone could satisfy my heart.'

Get Christ on the bridge, boys and girls. The fog of doubt and questioning may come. The more intelligent and thoughtful you are the more likely it is to come, at least the fog that makes you not sure of the things you have been taught. The other fog comes to every young person, who ventures out upon the world, some time. But if you allow Jesus to take His place early in your life, no fog that ever gathered will prevent Him from safely conducting you to the heavenly shore.

The Pioneer of Faith and of Salvation.

A STUDY OF THE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

By the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London.

III.

1. This personal experience being what is significant and valuable in the Incarnation, we may look at its general character before we turn to consider the light which is thereby thrown on particular incidents of the life of Jesus. The purpose of this experience is that the *Pioneer of faith and salvation* might be *perfected through sufferings*; regarding this statement we must ask two questions—(i.) Wherein consisted this perfection? and (ii.) what were the sufferings by which it was obtained? His perfection is described in general terms in 7^{26}. He is 'holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens.' 'Christ,' says Westcott *in loco*, 'is personally in Himself *holy*, in relation to men *guileless*, in spite of contact with a sinful world *undefiled*. By the issue of His life He has been *separated from sinners* in regard to the visible order, and in regard to the invisible world, *He has risen above the heavens*.' This perfection is not untried innocence, for He 'hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (4^{15}). Sin was neither the source nor the result of His temptation. He was not tempted as we are, when we are

assailed by solicitations of evil due to previous indulgence in sin, or when we succumb to the assaults of evil; nor need we assume that every kind of temptation to which man is exposed was experienced by Him; but only that temptation was as thoroughly real to Him as it is to us. Not quantitative equivalence, but qualitative resemblance alone needs to be asserted.

2. There are two characteristics of the perfection of Jesus which this Epistle emphasizes—sympathy with man, and obedience to God. He was 'made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted' (2^{17-18}). 'We have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (4^{15}). Because He has had the human experience He not only feels with us in His mercy, but so understands and responds to our need that He ever uses to the uttermost in His faithfulness all the functions by which our need is met. The functions are threefold: 'propitiation for the sins of the people' (2^{17}), 'succour' of 'them that are tempted' (v.[18]), and *intercession* (4^{16}); and it is evident that for each of these functions sympathy is a qualification. Without describing this propitiation as either vicarious penitence or vicarious penalty, as both terms are not strictly applicable to the sinless, yet His sacrifice must be regarded as such a self-identification of Himself in love with mankind as enabled Him to experience sin's consequences. He so put Himself in the place of mankind that He felt the sin, shame, and sorrow due to sin as His very own. He could even think of and feel regarding death what sinful men think and feel. But while His propitiation cancels the sinful past, His succour and intercession (the earthly and the heavenly counterpart of the same tender and mighty solicitude on man's behalf) guarantee deliverance from, and victory over, present evil: and to both sympathy is essential. But to remove a common misunderstanding, it may be added here that to feel fully and truly with the tempted it is not necessary to have fallen before temptation, but only to have endured it. He who resists until victorious, experiences the full force of the temptation as he who yields does not. Sin deadens, while holiness quickens, sympathy even with the sinful. So important is the consideration that it may be repeated: it is the sympathy of Jesus that is the best approach to an apprehension and appreciation of His Saviourhood.

3. Corresponding to Jesus' sympathy with man is His obedience towards God, and both are expressions and exercises of love appropriate to the respective relations. As the brother of sinful, sorrowing, and dying men, He shows His love as sympathy; as the Son of the perfect God, as obedience. 'Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things that he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation' (5^{7-9}). We must return to discuss v.[7] as a description of the agony in Gethsemane especially: but meanwhile attention must be concentrated on v.[8], while in passing it may be pointed out how v.[9] confirms the analogy we are insisting on between the experience of Jesus and of man. His obedience to God in His sacrifice has its counterpart in their obedience to Him for their salvation. (i.) 'He learned obedience by the things that he suffered' (*ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*). This statement does not mean merely that Jesus through the sufferings of His life learned to obey, acquired the habit of obedience, but that His sufferings were of such a kind as to make the maximum demand conceivable or possible for the surrender of the will to God; by His surrender He measured the distance between the deepest depths of desolation and the highest heights of blessedness. His sacrifice was a perfect act of obedience without reserves or limits. Was this obedience an exception to, a contradiction of His Sonship towards God, or was it its full and last expression? The clause *καίπερ ὢν υἱός* suggests the former interpretation, and Westcott *in loco* adopts it: 'Although Son and therefore endowed with right of access for Himself to the Father, being of an essence with the Father, for man's sake as man He won the right of access for humanity. In one sense it is true that the idea of Sonship suggests that of obedience; but the nature of Christ's Sonship at first sight seems to exclude the thought that He should learn obedience

through suffering.' Conceding that the writer of the Epistle intended a contrast between the two clauses, as for him the Sonship of Christ expressed the divine dignity, yet this exposition contains several errors on which it is worth dwelling. The introduction of such a phrase as 'being of an essence with the Father' fixes on the Scriptures the theology of the later creeds. The contrast between what Christ did 'as man, and for man's sake,' and what as Son of God He was in Himself and did for Himself, reproduces the dualism of the creed of Chalcedon between the human and the divine nature, and also the dualism which has introduced so much unreality into the representation of Christ's work between His person and His office. In opposition to this method of interpretation, we must insist that if the Incarnation is a revelation and not a concealment of God, then to the Sonship as temporally realized in obedience there does correspond the Sonship which is eternal reality. Not 'in one sense' only, but in every sense, 'it is true that the idea of Sonship suggests that of obedience,' and if 'the nature of Christ's Sonship at first sight seems to exclude the thought that He should learn obedience through suffering,' the sooner we get beyond the first sight to a deeper view the better for our theology. We shall never get an adequate Christology till we rid ourselves of the assumption that in the moral and religious sphere there is contradiction and not affinity between God and man, and that consequently there was a contrast between what Christ was as Son of God, and what He did or suffered as man for man's sake. In the *essential* trinity there must *be* the possibility of all that *becomes* the actuality in the *economic* trinity. We must insist on a more vital unity of God and man in Christ than the two-nature doctrine allows: but to do this we must get rid of the assumption of an impassible God, and must boldly affirm, in spite of the anathemas of 'the holy, great, Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon,' 'the monstrous doctrine that the divine nature of the only-begotten is passible.' But turning from Westcott's comment to the text itself, the contrast of the two clauses seems to be inconsistent with the general standpoint of the Epistle, which presents not a contradiction but a revelation of the eternal reality in the temporal experience of Jesus and believers. Insistence on the contrast of sonship and obedience would involve that the former is noumenon and the latter only phenomenon, to use Kantian terms, or the former idea and the latter only image, to use Platonic.

(ii.) The motive of His obedience is 'godly fear' (εὐλάβεια). Westcott *in loco* can here be quoted without any criticism. 'Εὐλάβεια marks that careful and watchful reverence which pays regard to every circumstance in that with which it has to deal. It may, therefore, degenerate into a timid and unworthy anxiety (Jos. *Antt.* vi. 2. 179); but more commonly it expresses reverent and thoughtful shrinking from over-boldness, which is compatible with true courage (Philo, *Quis. rer. div. haer.*, § 6 (i. 476 M). . . . Christ by His εὐλάβεια perfectly realized that submission which is obedience on one side and fellowship on the other.' Mind, heart, and will were in perfect accord, in entire self-surrender to the will of God.

(iii.) It is this obedience to God that gives its value to the sacrifice in contrast to all animal sacrifices. The author of the Epistle puts into the lips of Christ the words of the psalmist (40^{6-8}, LXX) in depreciation of animal sacrifices and exaltation of general obedience. 'Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body didst thou prepare for me: in whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure: then said I, Lo, I am come. . . . To do thy will, O God' ($10^{5.7}$). He repeats the declaration, 'Lo, I am come to do thy will' as the abrogation of the old and the establishment of the new order (v.[9]): and then argues that it is this obedience of Christ which makes the death of Christ an efficacious offering for the sanctification of believers (v.[10]). Such value is given to the sacrifice that it needs no repetition (v.[14]). Well would it have been for Christian theology if, dealing with the doctrine of the Atonement, it had always kept in view this declaration. It is no quantitative equivalence of Christ's sufferings and the eternal pains of the sinful race that measures the value of the sacrifice; it is the qualitative transcendence by the obedience of Christ of the whole moral history of the race that makes the Cross so final and perfect an expression of the whole relation of God to man and his sin, the divine propitiation, both judgment and forgiveness. For the present purpose we need not go further in this exposition.

4. The sufferings by which the sympathy of Jesus was developed and He learned obedience may be very briefly mentioned. What is made prominent *first of all* is His liability to temptation, which must include the whole range of His contact and conflict

with the evil of the world. *Secondly*, His strivings with God in prayer regarding His death are referred to (5^7). While we must not limit the reference to Gethsemane, yet there this element in the passion is most clearly and fully presented to us; and we shall in the next section see what light this saying throws on that event. *Lastly*, the death itself is presented as the completion of the sacrifice, and that death is referred to not as an event merely, but as an experience. 'We behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man' (2^9). Reserving the first part of the sentence for subsequent treatment, the last clause claims closer consideration, ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου. Attention may *first of all* be called to the variant reading χωρὶς θεοῦ, which might mean one of four things, that Christ's divinity was not involved in His death, or that He died with the sense of desolation (cf. Mt 27^{46}), or that God was not included among these, on account or for the benefit of whom Christ died. But we need not settle the question, as χάριτι θεοῦ is much the more probable reading. The grace of God was not the result of, but the reason for, the vicarious death of Christ. Because God is grace, God willed that Christ should die for all. *Secondly*, 'taste death' is not merely a periphrasis for 'die,' just as 'learned obedience' is not for 'obeyed.' Christ, because sinless and in fellowship with God, realized the full import of death as the penalty of sin, inclusive of the sense of separation from God, which is the sting given to death by sin. His sympathy with man made Him realize all that death means for man, His obedience to God recognized fully the will of God in death as such final adequate judgment of God in sin. His experience was qualitatively perfect. *Thirdly*, the clause ὑπὲρ παντὸς suggests also that it was quantitatively complete. He realized death in its universality, as embracing the whole race.

IV.

1. The Epistle throws light not only on the experience of Jesus generally, but on particular incidents in His life, to which we may now turn. We need not add anything to what it has been already needful to say about the temptation and the death of Jesus; but there remain three incidents to which fuller reference may now be made. The writer cannot be satisfied with the exegesis of 2^9 usually given. The construction is intolerably loose if the phrase 'crowned with glory and honour' refers to the Resurrection and Ascension subsequent to 'the suffering of death,' and the tasting death for every man. The crowning with glory and honour is a preparation for, and not a result of the sacrifice. While it is possible that the author of the Epistle might regard the vocation to sacrifice as itself glory and honour, even as in the Fourth Gospel (12^{28}, 13^{31}, 17^1); yet a more definite allusion is more probable. He writes with a definite knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus; and so we may assume that the story of the Transfiguration was familiar to him. That event was the completion of Jesus' human development: He was 'ripe for glory,' ready and fit for the glorious and blessed immortality, the destiny to which mankind had failed to attain. He had this foretaste of heaven, however, only to confirm Him in and equip Him for the purpose to surrender the glory and honour He might have claimed as His right, to put Himself in man's place, and to share with man the doom of death, which in no way was His due. Even if the author had not this event in view, it appropriately illustrates his otherwise difficult statement.

2. While it is probable that Jesus on more than one occasion 'wrestled with God in prayer,' yet Gethsemane seems to offer the most telling illustration of 5^7. There He 'offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears.' There He prayed that God might save Him, 'not from death, but out of death' (ἐκ θανάτου). 'The phrase,' says Westcott *in loco*, 'covers two distinct ideas, "to save from physical death so that it should be escaped," "to bring safe out of death into a new life." In the first sense the prayer recorded in Jn 12^{27} was not granted, that it might be granted in the second.'

One wonders why the allusion is not made to the record of Gethsemane in Mt $26^{36\text{-}46}$, as that suggests another possibility. It is not likely that Jesus was in any way doubtful of the necessity of His death, and desired to escape it. If He anticipated in Gethsemane what He experienced in Calvary, it was the dereliction (27^{46}) He shrank from, and prayed to be spared. It was surely εὐλάβεια that the Son should dread this separation from the Father: and yet the obedience to the

Father could be perfected only by His assent to even this experience, the maximum of suffering possible to Him. The prayer was granted, not in the Resurrection, although that followed in necessary sequence, but in His recovery even on the Cross, of His communion with, and confidence in His Father, as the words of self-committal show (Lk 23^{46}). It was surely thus that He was 'saved out of death.'

3. The last incident referred to in this Epistle has not yet come under our consideration; but it is interesting to note that the ascriptions of Sonship and even of absolute divinity to Christ in 1^{5-14} in contrasting Him with the angels are related not to the eternal existence, or the temporal incarnation of the Son, but as vv.^{3,4} show, to the Ascension. 'When he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; having become by so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name than they.' There can be no doubt that the author of the Epistle does assign pre-existent Sonship and divinity to Christ; in the quotations in vv.$^{10-12}$ he applies to Christ words used of God Himself. But as little doubt is there, those in agreement with Paul in Ro 1^{4} and Ph 2^{9-11}, he regarded the Ascension as not merely a return to previous glory (as in Jn 17^{5}), but as an increase of the glory and the honour, an enhancement of the dignity and authority of the Son of God. In his view the earthly life, work, and suffering of Christ has an eternal significance and value for the very being of God Himself; its result is taken up into the relation of the Father and the Son; it is no temporary episode unrelated to, and not affecting, the inner life of God Himself, but it is a moment and a movement of the very being of the Supreme Himself. Thus in Christ idea and image, noumenal and phenomenal, invisible and visible, eternal and temporal, God and man are one reality.

Literature.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

The volume on the *History of Christian Missions* for the 'International Theological Library' has been entrusted to the Rev. Charles Henry Robinson, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ripon Cathedral and Editorial Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (T. & T. Clark; 10s. 6d.).

It is an immense subject for a single volume, for Dr. Robinson begins with St. Paul and ends with Dr. Mott, and he takes all the churches, all the societies, all the men and women (without naming them all) with him as he goes. There is no confusion. The work has been mapped out as if it were an Encyclopædia article. And so far as we have been able to test the book, there is no respect of persons or of agencies. Every man, woman, and movement that has accomplished anything for the progress of the Kingdom gets an equal share of attention and a place in this great roll of honour.

The statistics are up to date. They are very many, but no weariness has deprived them of their necessary verification. There are lies, blank lies, and statistics, said the pessimist. The statistics in this book are too startling to be untrue; they are too startling both in their bigness and in their littleness. What accounts for it? Why here progress and prosperity like the rushing mighty wind, there stagnation and derision? God only knows. But sure it is that the missionaries are of the very salt of the earth. Even in these business-like statistical pages one can see that, and it is all the same whether they are preaching or teaching or healing; they all see of the travail of their soul, whether they are satisfied or not. There is no book that says more for the race than this book.

Canon Robinson has opened his book with a chapter on Methods. That was a good thought. Where does he find the best methods and the best account of them? In the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. How often do you return to that book—the Book of the Acts of the Apostles? It is the barometer of the New Testament. If you read it much and pray much over what you read, it will make a missionary of you, and when the next Survey of Missions is written your name will be written there.

THE CROWD.

'One day at a watering-place the rumour went about that the "sea-serpent" was lying outside, some few yards from the beach. Everybody rushed to the shore, and all saw clearly the monster's head, as it stuck out of the water from time to time. Even sceptics felt themselves being convinced little by little of the existence of the mythical monster. Some photographed the beast; others talked about rowing out in a fishing-boat to get a nearer look at it. A cod-fisher came on the scene, and explained that the sea-serpent was nothing but a brown stone, which now was covered by the waves, now came to light again. For years the visitors had watched the stone, without its having occurred to anyone that it resembled a sea-monster; but so soon as someone asserted that it was a living beast everybody else saw it in the same light, until the illusion produced by the suggestion disappeared before the cod-fisher's explanation as abruptly as it had arisen.'

This story is told by Arthur Christensen in a work which has been translated into English and published under the title of *Politics and Crowd-Morality* (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). This Crowd-morality is very much the same as that which Professor Gilbert Murray speaks of as Herd-instinct. It is a new study, or nearly new, and there is something in it. According to its students, there is much in it, and much more has already come out of it than we have taken notice of. Let us say, for example, that this horrible war has come out of it. Let us say that all wars in all the ages of the world have come out of it. Surely it is time we had studied it a little that we may watch its ways in the future and curb its evil inclinations.

The great danger lies in the fact that the crowd is subject to suggestion, and that when a suggestion catches on, anything may follow, a harmlessly silly thing or a most harmful and disastrous thing. 'A single example will be enough to show the power of social suggestion. The refined social world of the eighteenth century had cultivated the art of dying with the same mild, harmonious calm as it had shown in life. The women in particular understood how to die stylishly. They left the world with tact and dignity, without a sign of fear or pain which might grate upon the survivors.

'It was the century in which the death-struggle had passed the stage of nonchalance and reached that of epigram, the century in which a dying princess summoned her physicians, her confessor, and her steward to her bedside, and said to the physicians: "Gentlemen, you have killed me, but in doing so, you have been true to your rules and principles"; to the confessor: "You have done your duty, by frightening me out of my wits"; and to her steward: "You are here by the wish of my people, who desire that I should make my will; you all play your parts very well, but you must admit that I am not playing mine badly." The woman's soul went apparelled in wit to meet Death, while the Princess of Talmont's body was carried in a blue and silver robe to the grave.'

All this would be only absurd, if crowds were only mobs or mere cliques and coteries. But States are crowds, 'enormous and very heterogeneous crowds,' and when a State catches an infection—the infection of some suggestion of hatred or envy of another State—the evil may be incalculable, the misery untold. It is wise then to study the crowd. It may be studied with sufficient interest and alarm in this book.

NATURAL THEOLOGY.

When a lectureship in Comparative Religion was founded at Oxford, the first lecturer appointed was Mr. Clement C. J. Webb, Fellow of Magdalen. Mr. Webb has now published the first three courses of lectures delivered by him during the academical years 1911–12 and 1912–13. The book is called *Studies in the History of Natural Theology* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 10s. 6d. net).

In the first lecture Mr. Webb seeks to discover the meaning of Natural Theology. That is not easy. It is easy enough to say what Natural Theology is when we know what is Natural Religion. In Mr. Webb's own words, Natural theology 'must denote the reasoned and articulated account of what is implied in the existence of natural religion.' But what is natural religion?

To answer that question takes practically the whole of the first course of lectures. Mr. Webb proceeds in two ways. First he asks what is meant by 'Nature' in philosophical discussion, and finding that it means a great many different things he tries the other way. The other way is to see what natural religion is contrasted with. In the oldest

discussions it was contrasted with civil or political religion, in the later with revealed religion. But these two mean much the same thing. So it is natural as contrasted with revealed religion that forms the subject of the three courses of lectures contained in this book.

The second course describes and criticizes the 'Natural Theology of Plato.' With the third we pass to the Middle Ages, and consider Anselm, Abelard, St. Thomas Aquinas, Raymond of Sebonde, Pietro Pomponazzi, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury as natural theologians.

The work is both independent and unbiassed. Its scholarship is above reproach. The interest grows as the lectures proceed. Without doubt Mr. Webb has made a most valuable contribution to the history of the Philosophy of Religion.

CITIZENS TO BE.

Citizens to be is the title of a social study of Health, Wisdom, and Goodness, with special reference to Elementary Schools, which has been made by Miss M. L. V. Hughes, late Exhibitioner of Somerville College, Oxford (Constable; 4s. 6d. net).

Principal Viriamu Jones used to contend that two things were necessary, not one only—character and knowledge. Miss Hughes agrees. For her, knowledge is necessary as a matter of course. But character also, even in elementary schools. She might be content to see knowledge swallowed up in goodness, but she will never pursue knowledge for its own sake. To her as to all great teachers, 'art for art's sake' is of the Evil One.

She says: 'The more we can identify wisdom and goodness, the knowledge of what is with the love of what is right, the more are we in touch with our Masters. It is only the false narrowing of the intellectual aim to mere information that could warrant any hard-and-fast demarcation of it from the moral. Judgments of value are judgments of fact, and, for the Humanist, these facts are of the highest order, taking precedence of scientific facts just so far as these are made to exclude value. Accordingly we find that Humanist educators do consistently set the moral aim above the intellectual, or else refuse to distinguish them. Comenius, who most exalts "Pansophy," is assuredly convinced, with Socrates, that virtue is knowledge. His own definition of the educational ideal is "se (et secum omnia) nosse, regere, ad Deum dirigere." Herbart most nearly approaches him in this exaltation of knowledge for the sake of goodness. "The stupid man cannot be virtuous." Others lay less stress on the means, and are even, comparatively, careless of information. "The one and the whole work of education," says Pestalozzi, "may be summed up in the concept, morality." And this is the spirit of Arnold and of Thring, whose was "the ever-present conviction that the business of a school is to train up men for the service of God," and to whom "in a peculiarly vivid way life presented itself as a battlefield between good and evil." Most interesting is Luther's position, who puts the religious and moral purpose first, but asserts more forcibly than any one the supreme value of education for the whole of life, "were there neither soul, heaven, nor hell." A few years later Ascham, the typical English Humanist of the earlier School, sets down in order the schoolmaster's objects: "God's fear," "honesty of life," "perfectness of learning," and adds the requirement of gymnastics for all, and of much recreation for the "best wits," though he thinks that "base and dumpish wits can never be hurt by continual study." We are brought back to our first and foremost principle of balance, and it is needless to multiply the quotations of Humanists. Professor Laurie's summarising words are our best conclusion: "If the intellectual aim is always the same with the best writers, so even still more are they at one on the supreme importance of the moral aim and the value of gymnastic."'

Professor Muirhead has contributed a preface to the volume. It is worth that, although it needs no sponsor. In the preface, however, he has the good taste to leave the book to speak for itself. He says something of his own. He appeals for the place of the humanist (who is the enemy of the militarist) in the lean years that are to succeed the war. 'One of the chief lessons of the war, it is generally held, has been the unpreparedness in which we were caught at the outset, and for which the vague Humanism that has hampered patriotic effort in the past is largely responsible. After the war, moreover, we may be sure there will everywhere be a call for the strictest economy, and the country will be in no mood for increased expenditure on education. I believe that these arguments, so far from deterring, ought to act as an incentive to reformers to make themselves articulate. With regard to the first, I am prepared to agree that

things are no longer what they were. The old policy of splendid isolation, I believe, is no longer possible. With the rise of great democratic nations sharing the same ideals, new obligations have arisen for each — more particularly that of enforcing treaties and maintaining public law in the common interest. If, as may be hoped, the more advanced nations more and more recognise the necessity of organising themselves for this purpose, England will have to play her full part in the future policy of the world. This will not mean the acceptance of the continental system of conscription; but it may mean some form of universal compulsory military training in schools and colleges, factories, businesses, and warehouses. If this comes to pass in an educational atmosphere imperfectly permeated with humanistic ideas, there may be a real danger of fostering the military spirit. There is only one effective way of meeting this danger—to complete the permeation. This is the answer to those who would have Humanists lie low at the present juncture.'

Messrs. Allen & Unwin have issued a new edition of Annette M. B. Meakin's *In Russian Turkestan* (3s. 6d. net). It is issued 'to meet the sudden demand made by the British public for information about Russia.' It is not likely to satisfy that demand, for it deals with only a part of the vast empire, and it is so pleasantly written that it will whet the appetite for more.

There is scarcely a New Testament problem, if there is any life in it, that has escaped the Rev. W. Douglass Reid, B.D., and every problem is dealt with fairly and masterfully. He tells us that his original purpose was to discuss simply the doctrine of the Person of Christ in the Pauline Epistles. But the book grew, and now he calls it comprehensively *Jesus the Christ and Paul the Apostle in the Light of Modern Criticism* (Brown & Sons; 2s. 6d. net). At the end of the book—it is one of the few books that come to an end just when the interest is keenest—there are many pages of references and a most useful and accurate bibliography.

At the Cambridge University Press there is published the first number of a new quarterly journal—*The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking.* It is one of the numerous periodicals issued by the University of Chicago. Could such a periodical have been published in this country? Would it have been thought of? No, because we have never supposed that the public speaker could be made any more than the poet. The Americans believe that he can. How far ahead America has gone will be painfully evident to the British reader on looking into this handsome first number. Two of its articles deal with 'Research in Public Speaking.' Did you ever hear of such a thing? Another article is on 'Preparing Literary Material for Public Utterance.' We can understand a little about that. But then what has Public Speaking to do with 'An Experiment with the Referendum'?

The seventeenth Hartley Lecture was delivered by the Rev. James P. Langham. Its title is *The Supreme Quest* (Hammond; 2s. 6d.). There is also a subtitle: 'The Nature and Practice of Mystical Religion.' So it is another volume on Mysticism. Is it any the worse of that? It depends on what sort of mysticism it recommends. We have had books enough on a kind of mysticism that has nothing to do with Christ. That is not the mysticism of Mr. Langham. Christ is the only real and living way to the Father, as Dr. Moffatt translates the text in St. John. There is no passing Him by as if superfluous. Indeed, Mr. Langham scarcely distinguishes 'mystical' from 'spiritual'; and his book is an earnest appeal for a new and spiritual life, a life which is to be obtained only by faith in Jesus Christ. He does not stay with Christ—if the words may be used inoffensively. He comes to the Father. The supreme quest, he says, is 'to know the love of God, which passeth knowledge.' And the end of that, we know, is to be filled up to all the fulness of God. This is 'mystical religion.' To the practice of it Mr. Langham offers many suggestions, such as the religious use of the Bible, interior prayer, and daily use of pure intention.

There are three great preachers of our day whose name is John MacNeill. There may be a difference in the way the Mac is printed, or in the number of the l's, but the pronunciation is the same. One is a Scotsman, one an Australian, one a Canadian. The Canadian has published a volume of war sermons. From first to last they are war sermons, with all the joy of battle which

a Canadian congregation approves of, and with all the indignation which a righteous Canadian pastor feels for the enemy 'that hath done this.'

Mr. MacNeill has a wonderful gift for discovering the appropriate text. Does he determine to preach on 'A Place in the Sun'? His text is, 'And I saw an angel standing in the sun' (Rev 19^{17}). Is his theme 'The Day'? His text is, 'Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord: to what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light' (Am 5^{18}).

The title of the book is *World-Power: The Empire of Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

The Epistle to the Ephesians is extraordinarily rich in Commentaries. Nevertheless we welcome gladly a new commentary by the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, D.D. For it does not follow on the lines of any of the commentaries which have gone before it: and its own line is highly important. The title is *God in Christ Jesus* (Kelly; 5s. net).

Dr. Lidgett's method is to find out first what is the leading theme of the Epistle, and then to keep it clearly before him in all the exposition. 'Just as the unity of the Epistle to the Romans is to be found by treating it as an exposition of the Righteousness of God as revealed in the gospel, so, as it appears to me, the Epistle to the Ephesians will be seen to possess an even more closely integrated unity if it be treated as an expatiation on the subject of God in Christ Jesus. It is from this point of view that I have dealt with the Epistle in the following pages.'

This introduces the question of the authorship. For Dr. Lidgett sees clearly enough that the question of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians turns, not on matters of language or style, but on the ideas that are governmental in it. In the Epistle to the Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans the outstanding term is Righteousness. This is absent from the Epistle to the Ephesians. 'Grace, indeed, is magnified and the experience of the forgiveness of sins is set forth, but the term righteousness and the cluster of words springing out of it are not employed. Instead, the whole emphasis is laid upon life, and salvation is treated as a quickening by which believers enter into the resurrection of Christ and share His risen life. In connexion with and in subordination to this governing conception salvation is portrayed under the conception of spiritual illumination.'

And yet Dr. Lidgett believes that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians. His reasons do not need to be repeated. It is enough to say that they are good reasons and temperately set forth.

But the triumph of the book is in this, that while the central theme of the Epistle is always present, each step in the elucidation of it is treated with distinctness, so that a passage can be chosen anywhere and the exposition of it detached and enjoyed almost as if it were complete in itself.

The most recent of the Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications are: (1) *Religion and Morality*, by the Bishop of Winchester (6d. net); *The Sacraments of the Gospel*, by Canon J. G. Simpson (1s. net); and *The Verification of Christian Faith in Experience*, by Canon J. T. Mitchell (6d. net). Canon Simpson offers a powerful plea for an evangelical interpretation of the Sacraments, especially of the Eucharist. It is a small book to be seriously reckoned with.

The Eternal Saviour-Judge, by the Rev. James Langton Clarke, M.A., D.D., was well received on its appearance in 1904, and received considerable attention in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. A shortened, simplified, and cheaper edition has now been issued (Murray; 1s. net).

A valuable book on *The Cure of Self-Consciousness* has been published by Messrs. Andrew Reid & Company of Newcastle upon Tyne (3s. 6d. net). The author is Mr. James Alexander. It is valuable because its rules and recommendations are all based on a good psychological knowledge of human nature, and call constantly upon the human will for co-operation and conquest. Every variety of self-consciousness and every result of it is diagnosed and prescribed for. Mr. Alexander is sorry for the man or woman who blushes too easily, but he is still more sorry for the man or woman who never blushes.

The Rev. W. E. Sellers has been in communication with the chaplains at the front—the chaplains of all ecclesiastical denominations—and he has gathered from them their experiences, to which he has added his own, and has produced a remarkably interesting and sometimes quite thrilling volume, which he has published under the title of *With Our Fighting Men* (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net). For

the most part it is the record of the reception of Christ, whether slowly, after much thought in the trenches, or suddenly, in the act of daring or even the article of death.

Mr. Robert Scott has published a cheap edition of *The Roman Catholic Church in Italy*, by the Rev. Alexander Robertson, D.D. (2s. net). Dr. Robertson has lived his life in Venice and has studied the ecclesiastical situation all the time. This is the seventh edition of the book.

In the year 1911 the Rev. G. B. H. Bishop, Vicar of Cardington, Salop, spent five months in a remote district of 'Little Russia the Blessed,' about one thousand miles from Petrograd. And now he has written a book on *The Religion of Russia* (London: Soc. of SS. Peter and Paul; 5s. net). He acknowledges that 'in so short a time it was possible to gain only a superficial knowledge of the people and their national institutions,' but he has written popularly, believing that if his knowledge is small ours is less, and he has submitted his book to experts.

He writes most sympathetically. For he is an Anglican who looks towards the East for that appreciation which is denied him in the West; and, besides, he was well treated by the parish priest. 'His eagerness to meet my wishes in every way was on one occasion a source of great embarrassment to me. I happened to be passing the church just as a funeral procession headed by cross-bearer and bannerers was setting out for the cemetery. Thinking myself unnoticed I prepared to photograph the scene, when to my horror Bátushka Johann called a halt, and the whole party, including the mourners, posed for their portraits with the corpse in the centre!'

The book is written with much simplicity and pleasantness. Its illustrations add greatly to its general charm.

From the same Society there comes a little book by Mr. Ronald Knox, Fellow and Chaplain of Trinity College, Oxford, on Impetrative Prayer. The title of it is *Bread or Stone*. Impetrative Prayer is prayer 'which is directed in the first instance, not towards the discipline of our own souls in a particular attitude, or the enjoyment of union with God, but towards the obtaining of special favours from Him, whether for ourselves or for others.'

The Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., has written a book on *Biblical Discoveries in Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia*, and Canon R. B. Girdlestone has introduced it to its readers (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Politeyan believes that the Old Testament (he says nothing about the New) cannot be understood until its setting, its geographical and historical setting, is caught and comprehended. And he is very right. East *is* East and West *is* West, even though Mr. Kipling said so. We have to obtain the proper angle, more than that, almost a new personality, if we are not grievously to misjudge the Hebrews and their God. This it is that Mr. Politeyan provides. His book is thoroughly well illustrated.

From the Student Christian Movement there comes *A Book of Prayers for Students* (1s. 6d. net). It contains three parts. Part I. consists of a Service for each day of the week, which may be used either privately or for corporate prayer. Part II. contains a few Litanies; and Part III. a collection of Collects for use in relation to special needs or on special occasions.

The Implications of the Golden Rule.

By the Rev. E. W. Hirst, M.A.(Lond.), B.Sc.(Oxon.), Glasgow.

I. It is at the outset a matter of great significance that the Golden Rule distinctly contemplates man in society. The classical moralists have been far too prone to consider the individual *in vacuo* abstracted from all relation to his fellows. They have regarded him as though he were the inhabitant of a desert island, and as if he could be 'good' all alone. But according to the N.T. idea of goodness, and according to the implication of the Golden Rule in particular, a Robinson Crusoe could not, strictly speaking, be 'good.' Religious he might be. Day by day he might fall down on

his knees and pray to God. But as for 'morality,'—there would be no one round him with whom he could practise goodness, no one to whom he could act as he would have them act to him. And it is the defect of the text-books on ethics, and of the classical moralists, that these books and teachers view man as an individual, whose conduct is supposed to be as individual a thing as his health. Even Kant is an offender in this respect, in that he considered the essence of goodness to lie in actions which all other individuals besides the doer have merely to imitate or 'universalize.' No doubt he does seem at times to treat other individuals somewhat less externally, especially in the formula that says: 'So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of another, in any case as an end withal, never as a means only.' Indeed, Professor Votaw (Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Ext. p. 42*a*), likens the Golden Rule to this version of the Categorical Imperative.

And yet it is far from clear that this Kantian formula relates the *alter* to the *ego* in anything like the intimate way in which their connexion is regarded by the Golden Rule. In fact, the whole ethical teaching of Kant is vitiated by an imperfect doctrine of personality, by the idea that all selves are impervious, and are so many spiritual monads. It is claimed that each of these selves is an 'end' to itself because each possesses 'reason.' When, however, we inquire what it is to treat other persons as 'ends,' we are told by Kant that we cannot directly further their 'perfection' or 'self-realization,' but may contribute to their happiness only, though in treating ourselves as 'ends' we must seek our own 'perfection'—a purely individual pursuit. In spite of appearances to the contrary, Kant never establishes between ego and alter any intimate relationship. The underlying implication throughout is that selves are atomic and independent, and that morality is mono-personal. Therefore the identification of the Golden Rule with the Categorical Imperative seems hardly justified. For the former regards goodness, as the latter does not, as essentially inter-personal and social.[1]

[1] No doubt Hegel emphasized the close relation of the individual to his fellows, and regarded society as a 'moral organism.' But in becoming 'organic' in Hegel's sense, the individual ceases to have existence for self, and the 'whole' for which he exists is not strictly 'moral,' inasmuch as its nature is at any time inevitable.

II. The Golden Rule has had plenty of critics. Perhaps the criticism that is most frequently urged is the one mentioned by Professor Henry Sidgwick, to the effect that the rule does not forbid reciprocity in evil. Each member of a band of thieves—to take the usual instance—shows to his comrade in crime the same loyalty which he desires to have shown to himself. Little discernment, however, is required to see that such robbers do not apply the Golden Rule in any real and universal way. They refrain from robbing one another just because they are thieves and desire each their share of spoil, not because they are men. If they refrained from robbing one another on the ground that they are men, for the same reason they would refrain from robbing any one else. We are to do, not simply to five or six particular men just the particular thing we want them to do to us, but we are to do unto man as man anywhere what we would have any and every man do to us.

III. In the *Hibbert Journal* for January 1914, Sir F. Younghusband makes another attack upon the Golden Rule. 'It cannot be said,' he writes, 'that the Golden Rule represents perfection, for men have gone further still, and not in theory only, but in actual practice. There have been many men, and probably still more women, who have loved their neighbours, not merely as themselves, but far more than themselves: who have given up their lives, not only in death, but, better still, in life, for their neighbours, for loved individuals, for their country, for humanity. Now they have not merely done unto others as they would that others should do unto them, but have done unto others a great deal more than they would ever expect others to do for them.'

Undeniably, circumstances do arise in which it may be one's duty to neglect oneself for others' sake, and even to surrender life itself. And this conduct is not necessarily incompatible with the Golden Rule. Of course, such circumstances must be exceptional. For if every person died for his neighbour, soon no neighbour would be left for whom to die. Or if every person merely weakened himself in health, or neglected his business or his culture, soon there would be no one left in the position of helper, for all alike would, in such a case, have become needy and helpless. Such an unequal love of neighbour, if universalized, becomes impracticable and absurd. Self-sacrifice, of course,

there must always be, but this involves not the immolation so much as the socialization of the self.

IV. A subtle interpretation of the Golden Rule has been given by Dr. A. T. Cadoux in the *International Journal of Ethics* for April 1912. He contends that the Rule starts from, and bases itself upon the desires of the individual—'Whatsoever ye would.' It does not, however, concern itself with the satisfaction of the individual's desires in any direct manner, but of these desires after they have been 'transferred in imagination to one's neighbour'—'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them.' Cadoux then goes on to show how different desires are modified and enhanced by such a process. For instance, the desire for the praise of others, when, in accordance with the Golden Rule, it leads us to bestow praise on them, reacts upon our own fondness for praise, purifies it into the desire for genuine as distinguished from verbal appreciation, which desire in turn leads us ourselves to bestow on others appreciation that is sincere. In this way the pleasure of both giver and receiver is increased. The same process is illustrated in the case of the love of beauty, the desire for health, and the wish for happiness.

Now it is only necessary to read between the lines to see that, in so far as such a process of comparison results in a better treatment of others, it does so in virtue of an altruistic impulse which the process assumes to exist rather than creates. And the comparison is made primarily for the purpose of modifying the desires of the individual in such a way as to bring about their increase, and maximum satisfaction. The Golden Rule is used to provide a universal social reference such as will give to the desires of the individual, form, scale, and breadth.

But the Golden Rule in being so used appears misused. It becomes merely a means to enhance personal satisfaction, and is thus quite consistent with a doctrine of Egoism. We take it to be much more than a recipe for obtaining individual 'good,' 'life,' or 'satisfaction.' For it makes no direct reference to the content of the actual desires which any one may feel. Its real concern is that desires should be socialized, and that this should be done as an end in itself. It teaches that, as between ourselves and others, there should be impartiality of regard.

V. It is an important question whether this impartial regard is equivalent to a doctrine of equality. The idea of the essential equality of men is certainly very old. It received impressive endorsement from the Stoics. Cicero, in particular, insisted on it, and, like others, based it upon the fact that all men possess reason. The doctrine was dramatically re-emphasized at the French Revolution. Indeed, throughout the history of civilization the idea has had its influence. It is, for instance, the root conception of administrative justice—which should be 'equal,' *i.e.* impartial. Politically as well as legally the idea has done good service, forming the basis of the theory of representative government. And probably for a long time we shall still have to use the notion for all that it is worth. Nevertheless it would appear to be a makeshift. Its inadequacy is inevitable; for the idea of equality is quantitative, while human nature is pre-eminently qualitative. There is, of course, no sort of physical or intellectual equality possible to men. Neither could there be an equality of circumstances. People must live in different countries and climates and conditions. Utopia, too, will need both scavengers and scholars. Moreover, the relations in which people stand to one another as master and servant, parent and child, teacher and pupil, necessarily preclude any exact similarity in the details of behaviour.

Equality of opportunity is, no doubt, a plausible ideal. But it would be foolish to treat all people alike without regard to sex, health, sanity, and race. And whatever initial opportunity is used for the purpose of classifying men must be crude and practically momentary, for diversity of endowment and morale will at once demand diversity of opportunity. For in Utopia different people will be doing different things and must be accorded different kinds of chances for learning these different things.

The idea which is characteristic of Christianity is not the equality but the unity of life. According to St. Paul, we all form one body, which body is none other than the body of Christ. In the New Testament, also, men are regarded as brothers in a great house of life in which God is the Father of all. And that impartial regard for one another which the Golden Rule inculcates finds its justification, not in the fact that men possess reason or personality, or have an equal capacity for 'virtue'—there appears to be nothing intrinsically grand

either in rationality or in personality—but in this great truth of the unity of all life and the brotherhood of all men.

Now the ideal principle in a perfect brotherhood is surely 'From every one according to his ability: to every one according to his needs.' Some who think this maxim rather dangerous would substitute the word 'services' for 'needs.' But in an ideal condition of things no one would be pauperized by being merely a receiver of the bounty of others, for all would be givers as well as receivers, each giving of the kind that he has, and receiving of the kind of which he is in want. Such a state would, of course, be consistent with great inequalities. Some will give more, and some will receive more. But if all are one, and realize their unity, this will neither matter nor be felt to matter. Any other principle like that of 'reward' for services it is impossible satisfactorily to apply, as Dr. Rashdall has cleverly shown (*Theory of Good and Evil*, vol. i. chap. viii.). Rashdall abandons as hopeless the maxim 'to every man according to his merit,' and adopts what he calls the principle of 'equality of consideration'—meaning thereby that the distribution of the goods of life should be according to the needs of men as these are socially determined.

And in the ideal commonwealth each one would receive eagerly in order that he might the better give. Should a gift to the uttermost be asked of a man—even the gift of his blood, as in the case of the present European war—the principle of the solidarity of life will inspire him as no abstract principle of equality could. He will see that he is given innumerable blessings for which he never laboured, and is called to sufferings not always on his own behalf, but often for the sake of others, filling up in this way what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ.

A community inspired by the principle of unity—unity with one another and with God in Christ—will express itself through a State. That is to say, it will not be anarchist. Justice, however, will be swallowed up in love. This love will not take the form of charity, giving to your neighbours something for which he gives you no return. For all will have something to give, and love will express itself in such a system of exchange as will bless all with mutual benefits.[1]

Finally, love will be not the product of such a State, but its condition. A non-competitive society is possible or ultimately successful only when the human heart has ceased to feel the competitive spirit. To merge possessions is not necessarily to merge souls. And so the hope of the future can lie only in the greater prevalence of the spirit that desires to give rather than to get. Experience leads us to expect little from a mere social instinct or 'group-mind.' But love will prevail, we believe, when there is a greater realization by all men of their essential union with each other in God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

[1] In the same way, Ruskin, following Plato, maintained that wealth is an instrument of 'life,' and is to be shared co-operatively, as in a household.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford.

Chapter ix.

18. Since Shem corresponds with Samu or Sumu, the ancestral god of the 'Amorite' or West Semitic kings of Babylonia, while Japhet is Iapetos, a Cilician deity (Steph. Byz. *sub voce* Ἄδανα), it would seem to follow that in Ham also we ought to find the name of a deity. As 'father of Canaan,' the deity would be Canaanite. Ham, however, was also the father of Mizraim or Egypt, with which in the O.T. the name is sometimes synonymous, but there is nothing in the Egyptian pantheon with which the name can be compared. It is, therefore, possible that the Canaanite Ham has been identified with Qem, a name given to Egypt in the inscriptions, since in proper names Egyptian *q* may represent Assyro-Babylonian *kh* (ח) when the latter stands for West Semitic *ghain*. In this case the identification would have resulted from the use of the cuneiform script. In the

Mosaic age Canaan was a province of Egypt, and hence geographically connected with it.

20. 'Noah was the first husbandman.' Here we have an account of the origin of agriculture, for which see notes on 4^{1} and 5^{29}. The transference of the reputation of being the first URENGAR, or 'man of the soil,' from Adam or Cain to Noah seems to be due to the fact that the account of the origin of agriculture was combined with an account of the origin of grape-wine. The vine was native to the Armenian highlands, from which it was carried to Babylonia (in Sumerian times) and Canaan. In the Armenian highlands, therefore, the first grape-wine will have been made. The Assyrian form of the verse would have been *ina yumi-su ina ris sanâti* (?) *Nukhum-*[*ilu* ?] *amel ikkari ibsu-ma eris karani.* In Assyro-Babylonian *karanu* was 'vine,' *kurunnu*, 'wine'; the Heb. *kerem*, 'vineyard,' is borrowed from *karanu*. *Tîrôsh* is the Ass. *sêras*, 'new wine.' The Sumerian word for 'wine' is *gestin*, later *wüdün*. Assyrian also had the word *înu*, the Heb. *yayîn*, which like the Greek οἶνος, Lat. *vinum*, has been borrowed from a language of Asia Minor; cf. Armenian *gini*.[1]

21. Noah not only cultivated grapes, but discovered how to make them into wine. Perhaps there was a Babylonian legend on the subject, since Pliny (*N.H.* xxx. 51; cf. xxxvii. 52) states that 'the Assyrian king' Horus invented a cure for drunkenness. The Assyrian *sikaru* was 'date-wine,' corresponding with our 'beer,' whence the verb *sakâru*, 'to be drunken.' The Assyrian form of the verse would have been *kurunna isti-mma isakkir û* (*ur-su iptekhi*) *ina libbi biti-su. Ina libbi*, 'within,' is literally 'in the midst'; the Hebrew writer substitutes 'tent' for 'house' as elsewhere. The house of the nomad Israelite was his tent. The text, however, has 'her' instead of 'his tent,' as if there had been a previous reference to a harîm.

The feeling expressed in this verse in regard to nakedness is the same as that in 2^{25} 3^{7}. From the account given of Ea-bani in the Epic of Gilgames, we may gather that it was shared by the Babylonians. It affords a contrast to the feeling of the Egyptians and Greeks on the same matter. There is a curious parallelism between the sin of Adam, the first agriculturist before the Deluge, and that of Noah, the first agriculturist after the Deluge. Adam eat the fruit of a tree which was perhaps the vine, and so discovered that he was naked; Noah drank the wine and 'uncovered himself.' The curse, however, fell upon his offspring, not upon himself.

24. *Yêda'*, 'he knew,' is here used in the same way as *idi* in the Tel el-Amarna tablets. Though Ham is here called Noah's younger son, he is elsewhere always placed between Shem and Japhet, usually after Shem, but after Japhet in chap. 10. It is possible that there was a double tradition, one giving Noah three sons (like the three sons of Adam), the other giving him only two (like Cain and Abel). These two would have been Shem (Śamu) and Ham (Khammu), where we should have the same verbal jingle as in Jubal, Jabal, Tubal. If Ham represents the Babylonian Khammu, it would have been derived from a cuneiform text, since the initial letter in Khammu represents a West Semitic *ghain*, the name being the Heb. [ע]עמ.

25–27. The double 'he said' indicates that we have quotations from two different poems, or from different parts of the same poem. Hence the parallelism is not the same; in the one case Canaan is cursed, in the other case it is 'the god of Shem' that is blessed. There is no reason for thinking that the name of Canaan has been substituted for that of Ham, or the name of Ham for that of Canaan; Ham was 'the father of Canaan,' and in Hebrew belief the sins of the father were visited upon the children. Consequently the Hebrew writer had no difficulty in believing that the curse embodied in the words of the old poem was the result of the action of Ham.

The description of Canaan was literally true of it in the Mosaic age. It had been a province of Babylonia; it was now nominally a province of Egypt, from whose hands it was being wrested by the Hittites from Asia Minor. Its cities and native princes were subject to the governors placed over them by the Babylonian or Egyptian or Hittite king, and thus servants 'of servants.'

The fall of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty brought with it the loss of the Egyptian empire in Asia, which passed from them to the Hittites, and though it was partially recovered by Seti I. and Ramses II., it was again lost under Meneptah, the son and successor of Ramses II. Only those verses of the old poem are quoted which refer to the Babylonian and Hittite dominations; that

[1] *Kurunnu* must have been borrowed from the same quarter, since it is the Greek κάρπινον (Lat. *carenum*), the name of a sweet wine made in Asia Minor.

referring to the Egyptian domination has been omitted, since Egypt was regarded by the Hebrew writer as a brother of Canaan. But we may gather that there was such a reference from the statement in the first quotation that Canaan should be subject to 'his brethren.' The reference would have come between vv.[26] and [27].

Yahweh is here stated to be 'the god of Shem'; see note on Gn 4[26]. The founder of the dynasty to which Khammu-rabi, 'king of the land of the Amorites,' belonged was Śamu-abi, 'Shem is my father.' As Ham was the father of Canaan, so Shem was the father of the Babylonian king.

The play upon the name of Japhet—'God shall make wide (the road) for Japhet'—is made to harmonize with the political situation at the time. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets we see the Hittites descending from Asia Minor upon Syria and Canaan, and the recently discovered tablets of Boghaz Keui complete the picture of the formation of their empire in Semitic lands. In the age of Ramses II. they were paramount in Aram, where they dwelt 'in the tents of Shem,' and Canaan had for some time been their 'servant.' Since the days when they invaded Babylonia and helped to overthrow the dynasty of Khammu-rabi, the road into the region of Shem had indeed been 'made wide' for them.

In these fragments of an old poem or poems there are no traces of a Babylonian original.

28. Cf. the title of the list of early Babylonian kings in the tablet which interprets their names, *annutum sarrê sa arki abubi*, 'these are the kings who were after the deluge.' As Noah was not a 'king'—the first king being Nimrod—he 'lived' only, and did not 'reign.'

Contributions and Comments.

'Danaïds and Dirces' in the Epistle of Clement to Corinth.

All students of the Apostolic Fathers are familiar with the perplexing statement near the beginning of chap. vi. in the Epistle of Clement of Rome.

διὰ ζῆλος διωχθεῖσαι γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι, ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς πίστεως βέβαιον δρόμον κατήντησαν, καὶ ἔλαβον γέρας γενναῖον, αἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῷ σώματι.

'It was by reason of jealousy that women being persecuted, after having suffered horrible and unholy outrages as Danaids and Dirces, attained to the sure course of faith and won a noble reward, weak though they were in body.'

'Attained to the sure course' is not a very obvious expression, and the exact meaning of it is not clear. Apparently it means the point in the race at which victory becomes sure, namely, the goal, or somewhere near the goal. The precise signification of the phrase is not of importance for understanding the sentence as a whole, but one would like to see what suggested the expression to Clement.

The difficulty of the passage, however, lies earlier in the sentence. What is the meaning of Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι as designating Christian women who suffered in the Neronian persecution? The words may be taken either with διωχθεῖσαι or with παθοῦσαι, and the meaning is much the same whichever construction we adopt.

The common explanation is that it refers to the monstrous practice, specially common under Nero and Domitian, of turning the punishment of criminals into dramatic scenes for the entertainment of the cruel by making the condemned person play the part of some sufferer in mythology. Lightfoot (*Clement of Rome*, ii. p. 32) gives illustrations. 'Thus one offender would represent Hercules burnt in the flames on Œta (Tertull. *Apol.* 15, *qui vivus ardebat Herculem induerat*); another, Ixion tortured on the wheel (*de Pudic.* 22, *puta in axe jam incendio adstructo*). We read also of criminals who, having been exhibited in the character of Orpheus (Martial. *Spec.* 21), or of Daedalus (*ib.* 8), or of Atys (Tertull. *Apol.* 15), were finally torn to pieces by wild beasts. The story of Dirce, tied by the hair and dragged along by the bull, would be very appropriate for this treatment; but all attempts to make anything of the legend of the Danaids entirely fail.' Renan, who again and again adopts this explanation as the right one (*L'Antechrist*, pp. 167, 169, 173, 182, 187), admits that *Il est difficile de dire en quoi la*

fable des Danaïdes pouvait fournir un tableau sanglant (p. 169). Dr. Chr. Wordsworth (*Conjectural Emendations*, p. 18) was of the same opinion: 'It is not easy to see how Christian women could be made to represent the punishment of the daughters of Danaus, fifty in number, drawing water in vessels pierced with holes, and to reproduce what Horace calls (3 *Carm.* iii. 15) *notas Virginum poenas et inane lymphae Dolium fundo pereuntis imo Seraque fata*; nor would such a penalty, exemplifying the efforts of fruitless labour, be ministerial to purposes of persecution.' He therefore rejected the established reading as a primitive error to be emended conjecturally. In his edition of Theocritus (Camb. 1844) he made the brilliant suggestion that instead of γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι we ought to read γυναῖκες, νεανίδες, παιδίσκαι—'women, maidens, slave-girls.' The combination of the terms and the order in which they come are both of a very attractive character. The purpose of the chapter is to show that, in the persecutions, Christian women exhibited as much heroism as Christian men, and the three terms are all feminine and form a climax; not only adult women, but also tender maidens, and even slave-girls (whose surroundings are not such as to produce lofty characters), manifested this heroic endurance. Moreover, when written in uncials, the emendation does not differ widely from the established reading. The number of letters is the same, seventeen in all, and the majority of them remain unchanged: ΔΑΝΑΙΔΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΡΚΑΙ—ΝΕΑΝΙΔΕΣ ΠΑΙΔΙΣΚΑΙ. It is not incredible that, in the parent MS. from which our two Greek authorities and our two ancient versions (Syriac and Latin) are derived, the three words were substituted for the two. Strangely enough, in 1853 Mr. Basil H. Cooper, quite independently, suggested the same emendation in the *Monthly Christian Spectator*; and, when he heard of Wordsworth's emendation, was at first inclined to believe that it had been borrowed from himself.

This suggestion, thus doubly fathered, has met with much approval from competent judges; Baron Bunsen, in his *Hippolytus* (i. p. xviii, ed. 2, 1854), adopted it with delight, as freeing a beautiful passage from two monstrosities. Bishop Jacobson, in his *Patres Apostolici* (i. pp. 31, 32, ed. 4, 1863), declared it to be quite the best of the numerous emendations which had been proposed. Bishop Lightfoot, in his first edition of *Clement* (Macmillan, 1869), placed it in his text; in his second (1890) he restored and obelized the old reading, stating in his notes that he was 'disposed still to favour the acute emendation of Wordsworth.'

But there has not been general acceptation of it. Tischendorf thought it somewhat too free, *liberrima conjectura*. R. A. Lipsius, in reviewing Lightfoot's first edition in the *Academy* (July 9, 1870, p. 256), placed it among passages which 'are really improved in the new edition.' He praised it as a 'clever conjecture,' but he did not say that he believed it to be right. Donaldson thought it admirable; but in 1877 (*Theol. Rev.* Jan. p. 44) he proposed γενναῖαί τε καὶ δοῦλαι as perhaps better. Gebhardt and Harnack in their edition of the epistle (Lipsiae, 1876) retain the old reading, without mentioning Wordsworth's emendation, although they think it possible that the old reading is corrupt.

Perhaps the old reading would have been regarded with more favour if it had not been generally supposed that the only way in which Christian women could be made to act the part of the daughters of Danaus would be in having to carry water perpetually in vessels full of holes. That was the punishment inflicted upon them in Hades for having, in obedience to their father's command, murdered their husbands immediately after marriage. Why go to Hades for suggestions of torment, when human life is full of such things? It was in this world that Dirce was tied to a bull and dragged till she died, this being the vengeance which Amphion and his brother took for Dirce's cruel treatment of their mother Antiope. Hence the celebrated group known as the Farnese bull, the work of Apollonius and Tauriscus, now at Naples. In the stories about the lives of the daughters of Danaus we can find what would serve the persecutors' purpose, when they were looking for mythological precedents for αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια to be inflicted on Christian women. Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) tells us that there was a desire to inflict *ludibria*.

Danaus found that it was difficult to secure second husbands for the daughters who had obeyed him in killing their first bridegrooms, and Pindar (*Pyth.* ix. 117 f.) records how 'Danaus of Argos devised a *very speedy* wedding for his virgin daughters, ere midday had come upon them.' He placed all of them 'at the end of the race-course,' and declared that 'a contest of *speed*'

should decide which maiden each man should have who came as a suitor for them. Is it not possible that, in a similar way, Christian women and girls were exposed in the amphitheatre to be run for by the ruffians of Rome?

If we decide that the reading of the MSS and Versions is to be retained, and that the passage in Pindar gives the key to the right interpretation of 'Danaids,' namely, that Christian women were set up as prizes for those who chose to race for them in the amphitheatre, then we see how natural are the words that follow. Clement might no doubt quite readily have used metaphors taken from the racecourse, even if he had not just written something which reminded him of racing; but he would be specially likely to do so if he had been thinking of Christian women outraged by being given away as prizes to runners. There is little doubt that, when Pindar sang of 'a very speedy wedding' for the Danaids, he was thinking of the 'contest of speed' that was to decide whom each of them was to have as a husband; and it is not improbable that the thought of Christian women being raced for as prizes led Clement to speak of them as having 'attained to the sure course and received a noble reward.'

A. PLUMMER.

Amos vi. 2.

THIS verse has been regarded as difficult, and many modern commentators consider it as a later insertion (see commentaries, especially Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1903, p. 154 f.; Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, 1904, p. 199; and Harper, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, in 'The International Critical Commentary,' 1905, pp. 142, 144 ff.). It is held that the meaning of this verse is not clear, and that it interrupts the connexion of ideas between v.[1] and vv.[3ff.]. Two different interpretations have been given to this verse. One interpretation (given by Rashi and Ḳimḥi, and followed, among moderns, by Ewald, Hitzig, Keil, Driver, and others) is that the prophet tells the nobles of Zion and Samaria to look round and to see whether any cities they know, as, for instance, the three cities mentioned in v.[2], are more flourishing than their own cities. The inference would then be: your prosperity is so great and still you have no fear of God. Against this interpretation it is objected that—(1) if the prophet had intended to point to the glory of other cities (or kingdoms) he would not have chosen as examples such small kingdoms as those mentioned in v.[2]; (2) 'these kingdoms' cannot mean Judah and Israel, but must refer to Calneh, Hamath, and Gath (see Nowack, Marti, Harper, and the commentators quoted by them). These objections are, indeed, difficult to overcome. Furthermore, would Amos have intended to say what this interpretation wants him to say, he would have expressed himself more clearly. Amos is sometimes very short. He sometimes uses phrases which are very pregnant, almost fragmentary. A gesture, a thought hinted at, is often part of a sentence. But Amos never expresses himself in a way which is unintelligible. Again, if Amos had meant what this interpretation suggests, we would have expected הטובים הם, or, still better, הטובות הן instead of הטובים. Then it is really impossible that הממלכות האלה should refer to Zion and Samaria. This interpretation must therefore be regarded as inadmissible.

The second interpretation is: Amos mentions the three cities as examples of fallen greatness. The prophet says: If these cities, which have been so flourishing, have fallen, you are sure to have the same end. Most of the modern commentators (Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, Harper, and others) favour this interpretation. They compare Nah 3[8ff.] and 2 K 19[13], where such ideas are expressed. Finding the wording of the verse too inconvenient for this interpretation, they insert אתם after הטובים and read אם רב גבלכם מגבולם instead of אם רב גבולם מגבלכם. But this interpretation, too, must be regarded as impossible. The text has not got אתם after הטובים, neither has it אם רב גבלכם מגבולם. The change is quite arbitrary and unwarranted. But, quite apart from this textual objection, can it be seriously assumed that the prophet (or, if it is an insertion, any other Hebrew writer) would have expressed himself so obscurely? The passages which are compared have that idea clearly stated. Cf. Nah 3[8. 9. 10. 11]. There the fate of the cities mentioned as examples is stated. The same is the case in 2 K 19[11-13]. But our verse has not the slightest reference to such an idea as that suggested by this interpretation. There are also historical difficulties, for which see Driver, *The Books of Joel and Amos*, p. 192. This interpretation must therefore also be rejected.

It occurs to me, however, that the verse has been made more difficult than it really is. I believe

that the following interpretation, which I venture to suggest, furnishes a satisfactory sense for the verse as it stands.

The whole section (vv.[1-7]) is addressed by the prophet to the nobles of Zion and Samaria. According to the two explanations mentioned above, v.[2] would be an exception and therefore form a break between v.[1] and vv.[3ff.]. This is the main cause of all the difficulties found in this verse (see Harper, *l.c.*). In vv.[1. 3. 4. 5. 6] the idleness, injustice, and luxury of those nobles are described, and in v.[7] their fate (captivity) is announced. V.[2] interrupts the course of ideas. Now it appears to me that v.[2] also deals with the state of the nobles. In v.[1a] the nobles are described as being 'at ease in Zion, and secure in the mountain of Samaria.' In v.[1b] they are called 'the men of mark of the first of the nations, to whom the house of Israel come (for judgment, for guidance).' Now the prophet tells these nobles in v.[2] that in Calneh, Hamath the great, and Gath of the Philistines, *they will not find greater nobles than they are.* In v.[2] the prophet justifies his calling them נקבי ראשית הגוים, and thus amplifies what he said about them in v.[1]. Go to these other kingdoms, he tells them, and see whether their nobles have larger estates than you have, whether their prosperity is greater than your prosperity. V.[2] is then to be translated in this way:

'Pass over to Calneh and see, and go thence to Hamath the great (and see), and go down to Gath of the Philistines (and see) the good (prosperous) ones (*i.e.* the nobles) of these kingdoms (and see) whether their border (their estates) is greater than your border (your estates).'

V.[2] is thus merely a continuation of v.[1]. Far from being an interruption 'in the transition of thought from v.[1] to v.[3]' (Harper), it is an amplification of the ideas expressed in v.[1]. Thus *all* the six verses ([1-6]) contain a description of the prosperity, hardness, and luxury of the nobles of Judah and Israel.

I take the ה of הטובים as an article, and טובים as a designation of the nobles of those three kingdoms (מן הממלכות האלה). The Septuagint, the Syriac translation, and the Vulgate, also take the ה in הטובים as an article. Only they refer טובים to the kingdoms, which is unsatisfactory. But they thus give to הטובים the same meaning as I give: the prosperous ones. I refer טובים to the nobles (of those kingdoms). No objection can be raised to this use of the word טובים. הטובים מן הממלכות האלה is a phrase parallel to השאננים בציון והבטחים בהר שמרון. וראו has naturally to be supplemented mentally, as indicated in my translation. As to the correctness of אם (without preceding ה) see Kautzsch's edition of Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik* (1902), p. 483. No grammatical or linguistic difficulties, therefore, stand in the way of my explanation of v.[2].

According to my explanation all exegetical difficulties disappear, the text remains intact, the sense is entirely satisfactory, and the verse ([2]) is seen to be an integral part of the whole section ([1-7]), the meaning of which is now perfectly clear.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

Σαββατισμός.

HE 3[7]–4[13] is generally recognized as an intricate passage. The course of thought reminds one of a stream that occasionally flows underground. Thus something disappears from our view between 4[7] and 4[8]. The general argument of the preceding verses turns upon the unbelief of the Israelites in their wanderings through the wilderness. It takes a fresh start from 4[6], 'Seeing therefore it remaineth that some should enter into (God's rest), and they to whom the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in . . . he again defineth a certain day, saying in David, after so long a time, To-day' . . . if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts.' The passage 'in David' (Ps 95) is said to be a lyric of 'Israel's Renaissance' (A. B. Davidson)—the period of the Return, and to tell of a second national day of grace when a land of promise was again offered to God's people. It is possible, however, seeing that the LXX, which the author of Hebrews here mainly follows, ascribes the Psalm to David that the reference in the Epistle is indeed to the brilliantly idealized period of the early monarchy, and to the opportunity supposed to have been granted to Israel at that time of rising to a truly religious vocation. However that may be, the main point of these verses is the non-fulfilment of God's purpose in offering His Rest to the Israel of the Exodus, and the consequent reservation of that Rest to some later day. It is here that the stream of the writer's thought dives underground. Apparently there

came into his mind the recollection that after all, though 'they to whom the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in,' their children with Caleb and Joshua did enter in—at least to the land which had been promised as a land of rest. It was written in Joshua in respect to the final settlement after the actual entering, 'So the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest (LXX—κατέπαυσεν) round about according to all that he sware unto their fathers,' etc. (21^{43}). And again, later (23^{1}), a κατάπαυσις had been distinctly associated with the leadership of Joshua. These explicit statements seemed to cut the ground from under the feet of our author, who, as we have seen (4^{6}), had found the promised rest open to Christians because none before them had entered thereinto. He was led, therefore, to reveal his meaning by an uplifting movement of thought that disentangled his idealism from the associations of the old record. With grave boldness he moves forward upon a contradiction of the letter of Scripture, saying, 'For if Joshua had given them rest, he (God) would not have spoken afterward (in David) of another day.' Then to justify his interpretation of the past, and to differentiate his ideal conception from any attainments ascribed to Joshua, he concludes by flashing upon us a word which to his readers must have been practically new. 'There remaineth therefore a *sabbath* rest (σαββατισμός) for the people of God.' The change from κατάπαυσις to σαββατισμός brilliantly lights up the whole passage. Perhaps it could be said that Joshua did give to those he led a κατάπαυσις. He certainly did not give a σαββατισμός. What was the difference between the two things?

σαββ. is found in the N.T. only here, nowhere in LXX, and only in one place in classical Greek. We have, however, in one of the Oxyrhynchus Logia a sentence which its editors (Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, *Sayings of our Lord*, p. 11) suggest as relevant to the verse under discussion: ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα ('Except ye truly keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father'). A study of the whole logion, of which this is the second part, conveys the impression that σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον is here metaphorical, and that the logion means that 'the Christian's whole life is to be hallowed, as a Sabbath, in the service of God.' I quote from Dr. Driver's note in *D.B.* iv. p. 323. Dr. Swete, in an address published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (viii. 546), takes the same view, which I cannot see is weakened by the contrary judgment of another writer in the succeeding volume of this journal (pp. 141–142). Now the significance of the phrase in the logion for the interpretation of σαββ. in He 4^{9} lies in its agreement with those sacramental ideas belonging to the whole Epistle which Professor Nairne has so brilliantly set before us in his work, *The Epistle of Priesthood.* We are enabled thereby to understand better the author's thought in regard to the Rest Israel failed to win. It sends us back to re-examine the original conception of the land of promise. Take, *e.g.*, Dt $12^{9\text{-}12}$. (We are not concerned with any Pentateuchal criticism, for this was not before the mind of the writer of the Epistle.) In such words as these—'Ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance. . . . When he giveth you rest,' etc., the idea is not merely a rest of settled politics, but of established and institutionalized religion. 'The irregular, arbitrary worship of the wilderness is not to continue indefinitely' (Driver, *in loc.*). The whole experience of Israel in the Providence that should bring her into Canaan, and especially in the worship which was then to be set up on a more glorious basis than had before been possible, was to be sacramental to her. The things that were external—the end of battle, the settled land, the ordered worship—were to be signs and seals of an invisible grace, through which God should be revealed afresh, while the grateful love of Israel to God would be her contribution to a real and intimate communion. Broadly speaking, we may say the outward elements taken alone made up the κατάπαυσις, the inward, with these, the σαββατισμός.

Now that even the Israel, which had been disciplined into some measure of faith through the wilderness wanderings, failed to receive the σαββ. was just part of that failure of all the O.T. economy of which Hebrews is full. So the unattained heavenly reality was reserved for those who should become 'partakers of Christ' (3^{14}).

One remaining question may be considered. How precisely are we to interpret this σαββ.? The words which immediately follow 4^{9}, connecting back with 4^{4}, seem to involve a very primitive idea of the Rest. It is a cessation from work, as God rested from His. But we may feel sure our

author would not be content with a literalism. The rest after creation came when God had seen that all was very good. It was a rest not so much *from* activity as *in* accomplishment. It reminds us of the exquisite word in Zephaniah—'He will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing' (3^{17}). It had in it something corresponding to that conception of fruition which Eucken and his disciples have made familiar to us, the idea of a life which in its strength and joy gathers up the significance of a realized end. And it is this blessedness of an eternal world, ungiven by Joshua, that remains for the people of God who are in Christ. One can see the moral of this line of the writer's thinking all the more clearly when we remember the dangers that beset his first readers in their hankering after Levitical ritual and an institutionalized kingdom —dangers which in other forms are always with ourselves and from which only a Christ-dominated sacramentalism can set us free.

A. D. MARTIN.

Edinburgh.

Thoughts on Prayer.

WHAT is prayer? Many definitions might be given, but in all we should find that every prayer supposes two parties, one in need of something, and the other possessing the power to grant it. The prayer is uttered by the one in need to the one in power.

By this definition it would follow that if God wanted something from man, which man had the power to grant, then God might pray to man. Does He ever do so? If so, it goes far to prove the truth of the definition.

St. Paul says: 'Now then, as ambassadors for Christ, as THOUGH GOD DID BESEECH YOU by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.'

Again God says by Isaiah: 'All the day long have I stretched out mine hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.'

So in the one thing man can grant or refuse, God condescends to pray to man.

But let us see what else is implied by prayer.

First, the existence of both parties is assumed. No one will pray to an abstraction. A man must believe that the object of his prayer exists before he can pray.

Second, it is assumed that the object of the prayer can hear the prayer. Otherwise it is no use praying.

Third, that he can understand the language used.

Fourth, that he has power to grant the request.

These four postulates are essential. Without them there can be no prayer.

But granting all these, although there may be prayer—as when one prays to a hard-hearted tyrant to spare some victim; praying it, yet not expecting it; taking an off-chance, as it were—unless we have more than our four postulates require, it will be cold, hopeless, ineffective prayer.

What, then, do we want more?

Fifth, a knowledge that the object of prayer is not only powerful but kind. If we could hear of other petitions He has answered, we shall present ours more hopefully.

Sixth, an encouraging word. If the object of prayer, for example, has said that we may present our petition. That very permission to present it, is in itself an assurance that the object of the prayer is favourably disposed to us, and that possibly He will grant our request.

Seventh, a promise. But this will be valuable or not according to the honesty of the object of the prayer. If he be a rogue, a crafty person, or a tyrant, he may even break a promise. So we need to know—

Eighth, that He is true and faithful.

So we need to be assured of the following things before we can effectually pray:—That the object of our prayer exists; that He can grant our prayer; that He keeps His word. Then, that He is willing to hear; ready to give and forgive; and that He has promised something.

But there is another thing needed also before prayer can be efficacious, namely, that we, on our part, REALLY WANT what we ask for. If we do not feel our need, we shall not be earnest in our prayer, for whom, or for whatever we make it.

These being the essentials, we may say that prayer to God demands FAITH—that is, a firm belief in the existence and power of God—for apart from this we shall never approach Him. And secondly, a deep sense of need, for without this we shall not be in earnest.

Then, some promise that He will hear, and some PLEDGE of His willingness. On such a pledge, we

think, our faith might be strong enough. Well, here it is: 'He that spared not *his own Son*, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?' Our pledge of what He will do is simply what He has done.

It will be noticed that I have nowhere said that emotion is required. No: for, though it frequently accompanies prayer, emotion is not prayer.

Prayer is a petition presented to one powerful enough to grant it, and effectual prayer is that same petition presented in the full assurance that He will grant it. 'Whatsoever things ye ask for, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them,' said our Lord. And this saying is absolutely true, just as true as it is that a favourite son will get whatever he asks from his father. That is, he will get it, if it is not bad for him to have it. A father, for instance, would hardly give his little son a razor however hard he begged. It might grieve him to refuse, but his love for his son would override the son's prayer. We shall assuredly have 'whatsoever things we ask for' so long as infinite love and wisdom does not see that they would injure us. A child asks for cake and has some; asks for more and is told: 'You have had enough! more would be bad for you.' That does not hinder the fact of WILLINGNESS to grant, nor can this be called an unanswered prayer. It is answered by a denial kinder than the granting would be. Nor does the denial hinder the child's next petition, for he realizes that he WOULD HAVE HAD THE CAKE if he could without being made ill.

We need sometimes to realize this with God.

What, then, is prayer? It is the answer to God's prayer, for it is just the being reconciled to God, and so bringing our wants to Him as any child does to its parents; sure we shall get what we want, so far as love and willingness goes, but not sure so far as infinite knowledge and wisdom goes. But trusting that wisdom, and so loving and trusting God, whether He give, or whether He withhold.

EDWARD METCALFE.

Entre Nous.

German Spiritual Music.

Canon Scott Holland, who is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, has been contributing papers on the War to the *Commonwealth*, of which he is the editor. These papers he has now collected into a volume with the title *So as by Fire* (Wells Gardner; 1s. net). There are Politics, Doctrine, Philosophy, and other things in them, and there is something else in this paper on

GERMAN SPIRITUAL MUSIC.

'There is only one thing to be done during this disastrous strife. Whenever you have read your papers, and have been reduced to a carnivorous fury by hideous tales of outrage and horror, you open your piano, and you begin to play tunes out of the most beautiful, and tender, and beseeching book in the whole wide world—"Das Deutsche Geistliche Lied"—the Collection of German religious music down the centuries. There are six little paper volumes of them—and they begin with a Hymn of Caelius Sedulius, with words by Martin Luther: and they come right down, through all the superb royalties of John Sebastian and Philip Emmanuel Bach, to Schubert, and Mendelssohn, and friends of yesterday. Was there ever music like it, to wind into your very heart of hearts? These cuddling, crooning, Cradle-Songs in which Mary begs the dear Joseph to rock the child, or gather the hay for its pillow—they have in them the very soul of Germany—homely, motherly, sentimental, soft, delicious! There is song after song of this cradle-lilt: and, then, there are others which sing of Jesus, the babe, who will lie in our bosom, and be sung to sleep, with refrains of "Eia! Eia!" They seem to well up out of the very depth of loving motherhood. They rise and fall like a mother's breathing breast. They coo with the pleading sing-song of a brooding nurse. And, then, there are Shepherds calling to their goats, winning them by tender-hearted echoes to the safe sweet pastures. And there is solemn music from Hans Sachs, and Corner, and Crüger, for Sunday twilight over the wood fire: and folk-songs that have in them the strange soft pathos of buried peoples, who have lived in quiet forgotten places: and there is always Franck, and the great Sebastian, to kindle and to awe. It is a world of

peace: of home: of love: of pastoral joy: of a "family" religion that fills the house with its fragrance: of spiritual peasantry. No music compares with it for soothing crooning affectionate faithfulness to the God of the Hearth and the Jesus of the Cradle. As you play it, the Germany you had lost is found again, like the happy city under the Breton Sea, whose chiming bells Renan heard sounding through the green floods. This is the real Germany, and you love it: and your heart goes out to it: and you feel the blessing, as of an old mother, stirring about your head: and you are a child again, nestling inside the folds of granny's gown. How foolish and far-away, now, the rabid talk of your Treitschkes and Bernhardis! Away with them into the pit of forgetfulness! You have recovered your lost Allemagne.

'And, then, when we have got quite snug and comfy, and love our Deutschen friends, before we creep into bed, we had better just take down our John Morley—honest John! and read his lecture on "Machiavelli." It says the whole counter thing to Treitschke in a final and inimitable manner. It dismisses the Corsican conscience for ever. It puts us straight with the ultimate realities. It re-establishes our normal human nature on its sane ethical base. It disposes of sophisms. It clears the ground. It sweetens the air we breathe. It is absolutely healthy and convincing. We cannot relapse, after such a fortifying rally. We feel sure of ourselves. The moral law holds the field. It is the only interpretation of life which stands the pressure of facts. After all, was there ever so downright and catastrophic and damning a practical failure as the career of Cæsar Borgia on the lines of Machiavelli—except the career of the Corsican conscience with its piteous ending on the lonely rock, with the tortoises, at St. Helena? Is that a success that invites a following? Is that an end which justifies the means employed to arrive at it? Does it bewilder or intoxicate by its fascination? Good-bye, Corsican! Good-night, Treitschke! We can go one better than that.'

Ejaculatory Prayer.

The Committee of the Student Christian Movement has issued a small volume on *The Discipline of Prayer* (6d. net). It is an extremely attractive little book, both in its matter and in its outward form.

What *is* Prayer? 'Prayer is the reference of our lives to God. We refer the world of mind and matter to Him and we adore. We refer our sins to Him and we confess. We refer our needs to Him and we make petition. We refer the needs of others to Him and we make intercession. We refer our blessings to Him and we give thanks.

'If prayer is different from all else it must follow that the prayerful life is different from the life in which there is no prayer. For if we do not refer our lives to God we unconsciously refer them to ourselves or to others. The result of this may be complacency or self-contempt; envy or exultation; satisfaction or remorse; despondency or excitement. But the result of referring our lives to God and viewing them in His presence will be such things as contrition, sense of pardon, aspiration, faith, assurance, acceptance of the will of God, caring for the good of others, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost; there will be other things, too, without a name, which nevertheless subtly operate among men just as nameless elements are potent in the world about us. The man who is possessed by the spirit of these emotions is a different man from him who is possessed by those others, and his quality is of a different value in the world. The prayerful life is therefore different from the prayerless life. It moves upon a different path and towards a different goal.'

The volume ends with a Plan of Prayer for a Week, and just before that an effort is made to encourage the use of Ejaculatory Prayer. Outside the Roman Church we do not take easily to Ejaculatory Prayer. This is what the unnamed author of this book says about it. 'The prayer-spirit may be kept alive through the day in the midst of the press of many duties if we sometimes send a very brief prayer winging its way to the throne of God. Such brief ejaculations as these have been found helpful:

Jesus!
All love, all glory be to Thee, O Lord.
Thy will be done!
God only.
My Lord is crucified.
Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?
Father, forgive me.
What Thou wilt; when Thou wilt; as Thou wilt; while Thou wilt.

'By some such utterance at any time of the day or night; in the midst of our business or of our pleasures; at the thought of a friend's need or of

our own weakness; on being confronted with a sudden difficulty or an overwhelming joy, or even when we are helpless in deliberate prayer—we may touch every incident of life with heaven and make even a grey and monotonous day flame with an unearthly glory.

'Regular prayer does not exclude ejaculatory prayer, nor does ejaculatory prayer make regular prayer unnecessary. Regular prayer is like the great reservoir of water up among the hills which supplies the pipes in thousands of homes many times a day. Reservoir and pipes are mutually dependent and helpful. The reservoir supplies the pipe, and the pipe sweetens the reservoir by preventing it from becoming stagnant. And reservoir and pipe are both ultimately dependent upon the gracious bounty of the rain from heaven.

'Our daily Bible-reading may become a most helpful source of this brief form of prayer if we store our memory with its phrases and use them to clothe our sudden thoughts and needs.'

Katharine Tynan.

Some poets have discovered themselves in the War. Some have discovered new depths in themselves. Katharine Tynan was a poet before the War began: her war poems are a discovery to herself and to us. The best known gives the book its title *Flower of Youth* (Sidgwick & Jackson; 3s. 6d. net). Copies of this poem may be bought separately (2½d. each, or a dozen for 2s. 1d.). Let us quote it here.

FLOWER OF YOUTH.

Lest Heaven be thronged with grey-beards hoary,
God, who made boys for His delight,
Stoops in a day of grief and glory
And calls them in, in from the night.
When they come trooping from the war
Our skies have many a new gold star.

Heaven's thronged with gay and careless faces,
New-waked from dreams of dreadful things,
They walk in green and pleasant places
And by the crystal water-springs
Who dreamt of dying and the slain,
And the fierce thirst and the strong pain.

Dear boys! They shall be young for ever.
The Son of God was once a boy.
They run and leap by a clear river
And of their youth they have great joy.
God who made boys so clean and good
Smiles with the eyes of fatherhood.

Now Heaven is by the young invaded;
Their laughter's in the House of God.
Stainless and simple as He made it
God keeps the heart o' the boy unflawed.
The old wise Saints look on and smile,
They are so young and without guile.

Oh, if the sonless mothers weeping,
And widowed girls could look inside
The glory that hath them in keeping
Who went to the Great War and died,
They would rise and put their mourning off,
And say: 'Thank God, he has enough!'

H. Rex Freston.

There is not a weak or worthless poem in Mr. Freston's collection which he calls *The Quest of Beauty* (Oxford: Blackwell; 1s. net). There is Wordsworthian simplicity, as in this:

GOD KNOWS.

So much sadness in the world!
Is the pleasure worth the pain?
Are our efforts all in vain?
Who can know and who can say?

Little children—such are we!
For the rest—it seems to me
God must know, and surely He
Will explain it all one day!

There is also the skill of the translator, as in this translation of President Poincaré's poem.

IN OLD LORRAINE.

Delicious odours are abroad!
The night air fills the heated train
With those cool scents which time hath stored
In the dim forests of Lorraine.

Greetings, fair land of health and grace!
Within thy borders dwell serene
Strong scions of the ancient race,
Of loyal heart and dauntless mien.

And every time that I return
Some new delight mine eyes can see;
Some shy surprise at every turn
My boyhood's home prepares for me.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

49,391

FOR REFERENCE
Do Not Take From This Room
DEMCO
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY